DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 156 062 CE 017 055

AUTHOR	Ross, J. G.; And Others
TITLE	Assessment of Coeducational Corrections. National Evaluation Program. PHASE 1 Report.
INSTITUTION	Koba Associates, Inc., Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice (Dept. of Justice/LEAA), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jun 78
CONTRACT	J-LEAA-009-77
NOTE	98p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 20402 (Stock Number 027-000-00683-3)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Coeducation; Correctional Rehabilitation; *Corrective Institutions; Demonstration Programs; Educational Programs; Guidelines; *Program Descriptions; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Improvement; *Rehabilitation Programs; State of the Art Reviews

ABSTRACT

Representing the first nationwide assessment of coeducational correctional institutions, a study was conducted to determine the current state-of-knowledge about corrections, drawing on reviews of the literature, a telephone survey of co-correctional institutions, in-depth site-visits, and iinterviews with practitioners. The data was discussed and analyzed in relationship to the following topics: characteristics of co-correctional institutions; co-correctional models; synthesized measurement model; available evaluation data; research indications; evaluation indications; and national policy and operations. The results indicated that coeducational correctional institutions may be effective in achieving certain programmatically beneficial effects, such as reduced institutional violece, improved atmosphere, and curbed post-release criminality. However, little formal evaluation has occurred, since reasons for involvement in co-corrections are related more to the accomplishment of system-level economic objectives than to the potential positive effects of the presence and interaction of male and female inmates housed in the same facility on institutional functioning or the inmates' lives. The study concluded by suggesting several topic areas for further research on co-corrections as as well as a number of operational guidelines for consideration by existing and emerging co-correctional institutions. (Author/BM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED156862

NATIONAL EVALUATION PROGRAM
Phase 1 Report

Assessment of Coeducational Corrections

by

J. G. Ross, Project Director
E. Heffernan, Associate Project Director
J. R. Sevick, Research Associate
F. T. Johnson, Project Manager

June 1978

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CE 017 033

National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
U. S. Department of Justice

Criminal justice policymakers at all levels of government are hampered by a lack of sound information on the effectiveness of various programs and approaches. To help remedy the problem, the National Institute sponsors a National Evaluation Program to provide practical information on the costs, benefits and limitations of selected criminal justice programs now in use throughout the country.

Each NEP assessment concentrates on a specific "topic area" consisting of groups of on-going projects with similar objectives and strategies. The initial step in the process is a "Phase I" study that identifies the key issues, assesses what is currently known about them, and develops methods for more intensive evaluation at both the national and local level. Phase I studies are not meant to be definitive evaluations; rather, they analyze what we presently know and what is still uncertain or unknown. They offer a sound basis for planning further evaluation and research.

Although Phase I studies are generally short-term (approximately six to eight months), they examine many projects and collect and analyze a great deal of information. To make this information available to state and local decision-makers and others, the National Institute publishes a summary of the findings of each Phase I study. Microfiche or loan copies of the full report are made available through the National Criminal Justice Reference Service, Evaluation Clearinghouse, P.O. Box 24036, S.W. Post Office, Washington, D.C. 20024.

These Phase I reports are now available:

- Operation Identification Projects
- Citizen Crime Reporting Projects
- Specialized Police Patrol Operations
- Neighborhood Team Policing
- Pre-Trial Screening
- Pre-Trial Release
- Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime (TASC)
- Early Warning Robbery Reduction Projects
- Delinquency Prevention
- Alternatives to Incarceration of Juveniles
- Juvenile Diversion
- Citizen Patrol
- Traditional Patrol
- Security Survey Projects
- Halfway Houses
- Court Information Systems
- Intensive Special Probation
- Police Crime Analysis
- Youth Service Bureaus
- Secure Detention of Juveniles and Alternatives to Its Use
- Community-Based Employment Assistance Programs
- Street Lighting Projects
- Coeducational Correctional Institutions

National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice
Blair G. Ewing, Acting Director
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
James M. H. Gregg, Acting Administrator

This project was supported by Contract Number J-LEAA-009-77, awarded to Koba Associates by the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U. S. Department of Justice, under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U. S. Department of Justice.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402

Stock Number 027-000-00683-3

ABSTRACT

This study represents the first nationwide assessment of coeducational correctional institutions. The summary volume reports on the current state-of-knowledge about co-corrections, drawing on reviews of the literature, a telephone survey of co-correctional institutions, in-depth site-visits, and interviews with practitioners.

The report states that coeducational correctional institutions may, indeed, be effective in achieving certain programmatically beneficial effects, such as reduced institutional violence, improved atmosphere, and curbed post-release criminality. However, it is stressed that little formal evaluation has occurred, especially at the state level. Moreover, it is noted that many of the reasons for involvement in co-corrections are related more to the accomplishment of system-level economic objectives, than to the potential positive effects of the presence and interaction of male and female inmates housed in the same facility on institutional functioning or the inmates' lives. Indeed, interviews with practitioners and staff at existing institutions suggest that widely different functions for the use of co-corrections are operational, not only among institutions, but even within any single coed institution. Closely related to the range of consequences anticipated to flow from co-corrections are a wide range of policies and practices governing the coed situation.

The study concludes by suggesting several topic areas for further research on co-corrections, as well as a number of operational guidelines for consideration by exisitng and emerging co-correctional institutions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

			Page
	ABSTRACT		iii
	LIST OF TABLES		ix
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS		xi
I.	INTRODUCTION		1
	A.	Background	1
		1. National Evaluation Program	1
		2. Need to study co-corrections	1
		3. Range of expectations	1
	B.	Definition of Co-corrections	3
		1. An adult institution	3
		2. The major purpose of which is the custody of sentenced felons	3
		3. Under a single institutional administration	3
		4. Having one or more programs or areas in which male and female inmates are present in interaction	4
	C.	Purpose	4
	D.	Organization	4
	E.	Other Reports	5
II.	METHODOLOGY		6
	A.	Background Knowledge	6
	B.	Telephone Survey of Corrections Commissioners	6
	C.	Operational Definition	6
	D.	Informational Check-list	6
	E.	Selection of Sites	7
	F.	Site-visit Procedures	7
	G.	Site-visit Files	7
	H.	Advisory Board	8

III. DELINEATION OF THE CO-CORRECTIONAL UNIVERSE 9

A. The Emergence of Co-corrections 9

1. Precedents for co-corrections 9
2. Early co-correctional models 10

B. The Spread of Co-corrections 13

1. Planning for co-corrections 13
2. Precipitating factors 13
3. Expansion of co-corrections 16

IV. CHARACTERISTICS OF CO-CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS 18

A. Characteristics of Existing Institutions 19

1. Facility 19
2. Inmates 20
3. Staff 22
4. Programs 23
5. Policy 26

B. Changing Co-correctional Characteristics 29

1. Facility 30
2. Inmates 30
3. Staff 31
4. Programs 32
5. Policy 33

C. The Future of Co-corrections 34

1. Anticipated implementations 34
2. Phasing-out 35

V. CO-CORRECTIONAL MODELS 38

A. Induction of Models 38
B. Programmatic Co-corrections 39

1. Reintegration model 39
2. Institutional control model 41
3. Therapy model 42

C. Non-programmatic Co-corrections 43

1. Surveillance and sanction model 44

2. Alternate choice model 45

D. Programmatic and Non-programmatic Co-corrections 46

VI. SYNTHESIZED MEASUREMENT MODEL 48

A. System Inputs 48
B. Institutional Inputs 49
C. Institutional Processes 51

1. Contact policy 51
2. Control mechanisms 52
3. Implementation of policy 52
4. Inmate interaction 53
5. Program structure 53

D. Institutional Outcomes 54
E. System Outcomes 54

VII. AVAILABLE EVALUATION DATA 56

A. Existing Research Designs 56
B. Outcome Evaluation 57
C. Impact Evaluation 58

1. Post-release adjustment 58
2. Solution of system-level needs 60

D. Current Research 61

1. The effects of policy changes 61
2. Towards policy formulation 61

VIII. RESEARCH INDICATIONS 65

A. Data Attainability 65
B. Evaluation Problems 65

1. Constricted size of the co-correctional universe 65
2. Separating dimensions 65
3. Changing priorities and operations 66
4. Confounding of variables 66
5. Time-frames 66
6. Insufficient data collection capability 66
7. Absence of research orientation 67
8. Non-comparability of data 67
9. Sensitivity toward substantive matters 67
10. Lack of instrumentation 68

IX. EVALUATION INDICATIONS 69

- A. Designs to Improve Utility of Data 69
  - 1. Development of a data base 69
  - 2. Establishment of uniformity in computerized data systems 69
- B. Designs to Determine Effects of Co-corrections 70
  - 1. Demonstration project 70
  - 2. Post-release adjustment follow-up 70
  - 3. Study of on-unit behavior changes 71
  - 4. Cost-analysis of co-corrections 71

X. NATIONAL POLICY AND OPERATIONS 73

- A. Articulation of a National Policy 73
- B. Implementation of Standards and Goals' Models of Co-corrections 73
- C. Implementation of Standards and Goals' Operational Guidelines 74
- D. Implementation of Jurisdictional Policy 75

XI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 77

- A. Conclusions 77
- B. Recommendations 78

NOTES 81

BIBLIOGRAPHY 84

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1 CONTEMPORARY COEDUCATIONAL CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS 15

TABLE 2 CHARACTERISTICS OF COEDUCATIONAL CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS 19

TABLE 3 TERMINATED COEDUCATIONAL CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS 36

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This Summary Report consolidates earlier products of the National Evaluation Program Phase I Assessment of coeducational correctional institutions. During the course of this project, Koba staff visited ten co-correctional institutions across the United States, and conducted interviews with approximately 300 persons involved at all levels of institutional life.

We wish to express our appreciation to all of these people for their cooperation and openness in discussing with Koba staff all aspects of their lives in these institutions. Special thanks are extended to the Wardens or Superintendents who willingly gave large amounts of time to detailed discussions about the background and development of co-correctional programs: Mr. Lewis McCauley, Superintendent, Taycheedah Correctional Institution; Mr. William R. Turner, Superintendent, Renz Correctional Center; Mrs. Margot Eld, Superintendent, Correctional Institution for Women at Clinton; Mr. William H. Rauch, Warden, FCI-Lexington; Mrs. Betty Durland, Superintendent, Connecticut Correctional Institutional at Niantic; Mr. Vernon Housewright, Warden, Vienna Correctional Center; Mr. John E. Bates, Superintendent, Massachusetts Correctional Institution, Framingham; Mr. William Garrison, Warden, FCI-Pleasanton; Mr. Lee B. Jett, Warden, FCI-Terminal Island; and Mr. Lewis J. Gengler, Warden, FCI-Fort Worth. The wardens or superintendents of the coed facilities not visited by the project also provided a great deal of information about their institutions in telephone conversations, and Koba acknowledges their cooperation.

Throughout the project, several people aided in the conceptualization of various reports, and provided information and advice concerning the overall goals and methods of the National Evaluation Program. Koba gratefully acknowledges the assistance of Dr. Phyllis Jo Baunach and Ms. Jan Hulla of the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. Appreciation also goes to Mr. Joe Nay, Ms. Lucille Graham, and Mr. Elliot Ratner, all of the Urban Institute.

The National Advisory Board of the project provided assistance in several ways, but especially in their suggestions and criticisms of both procedures and sensitivities required for the assessment. Members of the Advisory Board, who shared with the project their extensive theoretical and practical knowledge of co-corrections and corrections in general, were: Ms. Helene E. Cavior, Director of Research for FCI-Pleasanton and the Western Region of the Bureau of Prisons; Mr. Vernon Housewright, Superintendent, Vienna Correctional Center; Ms. Jacqueline Crawford, Superintendent, Nebraska Center for Women; Dr. David Ward, Professor, Department of Criminal Justice Studies, University of Minnesota; Mr. Lawrence Grossman, Warden, FCI-Lompoc; and Ms. Catherine Milton, former Director of the National Resource Center on Women Offenders.

Several others lent their expertise in the field of co-corrections to the project and these persons also deserve special mention: Mr. Howard Kitchener, Director of Research, U.S. Bureau of Prisons; Mr. Charles Campbell, former Warden, FCI-Fort Worth; and Dr. Francis J. Carney, Director of Research, Massachusetts Department of Corrections. Finally, Koba gratefully acknowledges the practitioners, scholars and other experts, too numerous to mention, whose assistance was invaluable in the conduct of this assessment.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background

1. National Evaluation Program. The National Evaluation Program has among its goals the timely assessment and extension of knowledge in certain "topic areas," in response to the requirements of policy- and decision-makers for sound information on major criminal justice hypotheses, results and national standards. Candidate "topic areas" for assessment under the NEP are identified annually through a survey of issues and concerns among State Planning Agencies and LEAA Regional and National offices. Implemented NEP Phase I assessments focus on the actual processes involved in a given "topic area," and can efficiently identify facilitating and impeding factors in law enforcement and criminal justice activities. As a result, several completed NEP Phase I studies have revealed broad discrepancies between program theory/policy and operating program activities, allowing early consideration of policy decisions in the "topic area."[1]

2. Need to study co-corrections. The topic of coeducational correctional institutions has received widespread attention in the popular press, and has captured increasing interest from administrators and scholars in many areas of the country. The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals has called coeducational programs "an invaluable tool for exploring and dealing with social and emotional problems related to identity conflicts that many offenders experience." The Commission urged the abolition of the present sexually segregated system and the adoption of a "fully integrated system based on all offenders' needs." Within the few years since the Commissions' endorsement, even while the number of coed institutions has expanded rapidly, few systematic research efforts have been initiated. At the same time, several factors suggest a potential further proliferation of coed institutions, including the Commission's endorsement, overcrowding in single-sex institutions, the expressed need for expanded program options for female offenders, possible shifts in correctional administrators' philosophies, the higher costs of maintaining separate institutions for women, and the range of expectations which have become associated with implementation of co-corrections. These conditions suggested the timeliness of implementing a Phase I assessment.

3. Range of expectations. Coeducational institutions have been cited as a potential solution to a wide variety of problems in corrections. Among these expectations have been:

- Reduction of the dehumanizing and destructive aspects of confinement by allowing continuity or resumption of heterosexual relationships;
- Reduction of institutional control problems through the weakening of disruptive homosexual systems, reduction of predatory homosexual activity, lessening of assaultive behavior and the diversion of inmate interests and activities;
- Protection for inmates likely to be involved in "trouble" were they in a predominantly same-sex institution;

- Provision of an additional tool for creating a more normal, less institutionalized atmosphere;
- Cushioning the shock of adjustment for releasees, by reducing the number and intensity of adjustments to be made;
- Realization of economies of scale in terms of more efficient utilization of available space, staff, and programs;
- Relief of immediate or anticipated overcrowding, sometimes of emergency proportions;
- Reduction in the need for civilian labor, by provision of both light and heavy inmate work forces;
- Increased diversification and flexibility of program offerings, and equal access for males and females;
- Expansion of treatment potentials for working with inmates having "sexual problems," and development of positive heterosexual relationships, and coping skills;
- Relief of immediate or anticipated legal pressures to provide equal access to programs and services to both sexes;
- Expanded career opportunities for women, previously often "boxed into" the single state women's institution, as correctional staff.

In addition to the above expectations about positive outcomes to be derived from co-corrections, a level of concern has developed about the potential adverse consequences of co-corrections in three areas:

- Effects on women. In this regard it has been questioned whether in co-corrections: (a) the introduction of women occurs primarily for the purposes of institutional control, and to "round out rough corners"; (b) women become the focus of control, because of fears over possible pregnancy; and (c) women are moved back into passive, dependency-oriented roles, while in single-sex institutions, women assume a fuller range of roles.
- Effects on those "already there." It has been questioned whether, when co-corrections is introduced to a previously existing institution: (a) control increases, and security levels are modified or re-defined; (b) movement is restricted, and access to programs reduced; (c) either the minority or the entering population becomes the focus of control; (d) the entering population is perceived as the cause of increased security measures; (e) the sexes are further polarized; and (f) certain costs increase along with the intensification of security.

- Effects on community relationships. It has been asked in this regard whether co-corrections: (a) damages relationships between inmates and their spouses and families on the outside; and (b) leads to a loss of community support, due to the perception that the deprivation of heterosexual relationships is a necessary aspect of imprisonment.

While the Phase I assessment could not promise a definitive assessment of co-corrections, one of its purposes was to "sort out" and determine the strength of evidence available to support the range of expectations which have surrounded both the planning and implementation of the coeducational concept.

B. Definition of Co-corrections

In order to provide manageable scope for an investigation into the "uncharted waters" of co-corrections, a basic definition was developed which clearly indicated four key elements. For the purposes of this study, to be considered a coeducational correctional institution, a facility had to be: an adult institution; the major purpose of which is the custody of sentenced felons; under a single administration; having one or more programs or areas in which male and female inmates from the institution are both present and in interaction.

1. An adult institution. Juvenile institutions and institutions which regularly contain minors in the population were excluded. The exclusion of juvenile institutions was made primarily because of the differences between adult and juvenile offenders: juveniles have often been incarcerated for "status" offenses which would not even be crimes if committed by adults, and hence juvenile criminality is not comparable with that of adults; juveniles are also generally regarded as differing vastly from adults in values, emotional maturity, personal goals, and corresponding treatment modalities. Moreover, juvenile facilities have traditionally been coed in many places (in some, for over a century), and public response to such institutions has been less resistent than towards adult institutions. The exclusion of juvenile institutions, however, did not apply to institutions for youthful offenders, if the population consists of eighteen year olds and above; to institutions which restrict the population of one sex, while admitting a full age range from the opposite sex; or to institutions which incarcerate the entire jurisdiction's offender population of one sex, including some juveniles.

2. The major purpose of which is the custody of sentenced felons. This aspect of the definition excluded jails and specialized adult institutions, such as diagnostic centers, camps, and halfway houses. This exclusion was made on the assumption that institutional confinement will continue to be a principal means of maintaining custody. This did not exclude institutions which occasionally house misdemeanants or pre-sentence cases, or circumstances in which a given institution was the single institution within the jurisdiction for one sex.

3. Under a single institutional administration. This excluded separate institutions which had a certain number of shared programs or services. In particular, this excluded coordinate (or brother-sister) institutions, both those on the same grounds but under separate institutional administrations, as well as institutions between which certain inmates are bussed to share particular activities, such as dances, work- and

study-release and medical services. The sharing of certain programs and services by two or several institutions could not remotely be considered an innovative practice.

4. Having one or more programs or areas in which male and female inmates are present and in interaction. This excluded institutions in which males and females are both present, but separated. The implication was that opportunities be made available, within and even outside the institutional confines, for regular, daily interaction between male and female inmates in one or more facets of institutional life, including vocational, academic, therapy, recreation, social, industrial, religious, and other programs and activities. They are inhabitants of the same institution and, in varying degrees, are subject to the same controls and participate in the same programs; theirs is a shared life which, to a degree varying between and within institutions, might mirror the breadth of potential structured and spontaneous interactions that occur "outside, in the free." By requiring interaction in only one (or more) areas, it was possible that a large number of institutions might qualify as coed.

C. Purpose

The purposes of the Phase I assessment of co-corrections were to identify important issues in the topic area, describe coed institutions currently operational, assess the state of knowledge about the efficacy of co-corrections in achieving its objectives, and delineate potential research designs which might be employed at both the national and local levels in further investigation of the effects of implementing the co-correctional concept. The investigators viewed their task as partly one of taking a first step toward a definitive evaluation of co-corrections. However, the immediate needs of policy-makers and practitioners for information on which to base decisions had equal impact in steering the conduct of the study. The Summary Report represents a consolidation of those reports which have periodically been issued during the study's performance.

D. Organization

This report is organized into ten additional parts. Chapter II contains the study's research methodology. Chapter III traces the emergence and spread of contemporary coed institutions. Chapter IV presents information collected in site-visits through a description of both key characteristics evident at the point-in-time visits were made, as well as changes occurring over time, and emerging future trends. Chapter V sorts out the multiplicity of expectations about co-corrections into five models, representing distinct "chains of assumptions" about achievement of intended or expected outcomes. Chapter VI synthesizes the five co-correctional models into a single measurement model, applicable across the universe of coed institutions. Chapter VII assesses completed and ongoing research in the context of intended co-correctional outcomes and objectives. Chapter VIII considers general problems in performing research on co-corrections. Chapter IX suggests several designs for filling gaps in knowledge about co-corrections. Chapter X considers the correspondence and divergence between operational activities and practices, and the expectations outlined by the Standards and Goals Commission. Chapter XI briefly states conclusions and recommendations.

While the entire report will hopefully be of interest to both the general reader and the practitioner, certain chapters may be of greater value to those with particular interests. Although the first five and last two chapters are of a more general nature, the intervening chapters - - VI, VII, VIII and IX - - are oriented more toward those planning or contemplating the implementation of research in the area.

E. Other Reports

The interested reader may wish to consult prior reports upon which this Summary Report was based. The following reports are also readily available:

- Issues Paper represents a discussion of underlying assumptions, and of historical, theoretical, and operational issues.
- Frameworks Paper develops the means for plausible testing of "chains-of-assumptions" about co-corrections, and synthesizes these in a measurement model around which evaluation could be centered.
- General Assessment builds on the Frameworks Paper to array existing knowledge on the measurement model, and identifies the strengths and weaknesses of the existing knowledge base concerning co-corrections.
- Phase II Design more fully outlines potential designs for filling gaps in knowledge about co-corrections.
- Single-Institution Evaluation Design is an adaptation of the Frameworks Paper, to be used by individual institutions interested in monitoring or evaluating their performance.

II. METHODOLOGY

While the National Evaluation Program delineated a series of general "steps" to which any Phase I assessment should conform, this left a great deal of latitude in determining the actual methods by which tasks were to be accomplished. The methods were influenced by the relative "infancy" of the area of co-corrections, the paucity of existing evaluation literature, the multiplicity of program objectives, and the need for sensitivity to changes occurring over time. However, it is difficult, if not impossible, to indicate an actual sequence of steps or methods, as if one step were completed before another began: the process entailed moving back and forth from one step to another, and refining the results of one method in light of later experience. Upon the methods outlined below the conceptual analyses were built.

A. Background Knowledge

General information was collected from books, articles, papers, grant applications, research proposals, feasibility studies, master plans, progress reports, final reports, evaluations, and expert opinion. Expert opinion was crucial due to both the dearth of published information on the subject, and the high degree of current activity in the area.

B. Telephone Survey of Corrections Commisisoners

Because LEAA's Grant Management Information System revealed only one small grant awarded directly for an aspect of co-corrections, this was considered an unprofitable means through which to identify existing, as well as terminated and planned, coed institutions. Therefore, an early task of the project was to identify all coed institutions throughout the country by another method. This was accomplished by telephone contact with the office of the commissioner/director of corrections in each state, and with the research office of the Bureau of Prisons. Telephone contact was preceeded by a mailed description of the project's scope and goals, and a request that specified information be prepared in anticipation of a call from project staff. During telephone contacts, directors were asked to identify existing, planned, or terminated coed institutions in their jurisdiction, and to supply descriptive literature about these institutions. Follow-up calls were made to the identified institutions to obtain sufficient information for determining the locations to which site-visits were to be made.

C. Operational Definition

A "theoretical," or general definition of co-corrections was provided to commissioners, and partly as a result of their responses and those of institutional administrators, this definition was operationalized in a form which was further refined through site-visits.

D. Informational Check-list

A comprehensive list of ninety-two questions, to provide the information needed for an understanding of each general institutional program and the place of co-corrections within it, was derived from the literature; expanded and sharpened in light of expert opinion and the telephone surveys described above; and given final form after two site-visits were completed. This list served as a "site-visit guide," to ensure that all areas of interest were addressed.

E. Selection of Sites

Because the size of the co-correctional universe exceeded expectations, criteria were needed by which to select the institutions to be intensively studied on-site by the project. Only one institution had been a recipient of LEAA funds for a co-correctional program, and only two could boast the presence of completed research on co-corrections; therefore, LEAA funding and availability of research were not viewed as appropriate criteria. Instead, the criterion brought to bear on the selection process was the passage of a period of time presumably sufficient to develop both expectations about co-corrections and a data base. Only institutions which had "gone coed" prior to January 1976 were considered for site-visits. This narrowed down the selection process, and tended to exclude institutions which were marginally co-correctional (e.g., were disproportionately composed of one sex, or were specialized institutions for one of the sexes). The project team intended to visit each of the twelve institutions which had "gone coed" prior to January 1976, and was prevented from doing this only by situational factors.

F. Site-Visit Procedures

Advance information was sent to institutions to be visited about the types of information needed, and the types of persons the project desired to interview. Two project team members visited ten selected coed institutions for an average of three days per institution, during which research procedures remained flexible. Administration and staff at a given institution ordinarily "oriented" the project team through early interviews, and a tour of the facility. Interviews usually started with administration, and progressed through staff, line-staff, and inmates. Efforts were made to contact key administrators, department heads and correctional officers. Two main criteria were used to select male and female inmates for interviews: comparative institutional experience, to include previous single-sex, other co-correctional, and absence of previous institutional experience; and a range of heterosexual contact levels, from relative isolation from heterosexual contact, to regular involvement in relationships, including those which resulted in pregnancy. Other criteria used in selecting inmates for interviews included race, age and unit. Inmate interviews usually did not begin until the second day, and key members of the administration and staff were re-interviewed in close-out sessions on the third day. An average of twenty-eight different persons were interviewed at each institution. The site-visit guide, or instrument, was periodically used as a check list to determine gaps in the information collected at a given institution, and as the basis for requesting guidance from the administration about the most knowledgeable source of information for each unanswered question.

G. Site-visit Files

A site-visit file was developed for each institution which consisted of "field notes" in the raw form of interview transcripts and supporting documentation, as well as in detailed narrative and graphic descriptions created by the project team to represent all institutional processes and outcomes assumed by the institutions to be related to co-corrections. Telephone call-backs were made to most institutions to obtain missing information, or reconcile conflicting bits of information. These descriptive field notes were submitted to the warden or superintendent of each institution for his or her review and comment, and were compiled as Interventions Papers.

H. Advisory Board

The Advisory Board was composed of six persons whose diverse experiences in corrections helped provide the balanced perspective needed by the project. The Board included three persons with, and three without, current or past affiliations with coed institutions; three administrators and three researchers; and a wide range of attitudes and opinions about both the advantages and disadvantages of co-corrections, and the sensitivities required to communicate information about the concept. The Advisory Board met twice: first on February 23, after two sites had been visited, to discuss the Issues Paper and the first site-visits; second, on August 15, to discuss the Frameworks Paper, General Assessment, and the Summary Report.

III. DELINEATION OF THE CO-CORRECTIONAL UNIVERSE

The absence of a clear sense for the size and shape of the co-correctional universe has perpetuated a dearth of communication networks among coed institutions, except in the Federal system, and generally hindered conceptualization in the topic area. The purpose of this Chapter is to briefly trace the emergence of co-corrections from its early precedents, through the opening of the first contemporary coed institutions, to the recent spread of the coed concept. Chapter IV will further elaborate on the characteristics of existing institutions.

A. The Emergence of Co-corrections

1. Precedents for co-corrections. Despite the common perception that prisons housing male and female inmates are a new phenomenon, the history of corrections demonstrates that, in actuality, single-sex institutions became the norm in western society in the second half of the nineteenth century, after centuries of housing the sexes together.

a. Sexual non-differentiation of offenders. Housing of men and women in the same prison and permitting their interaction - - which, by only recent convention, has been termed co-corrections - - is not a new practice. Before the beginnings of penal reform in the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries men and women were often detained in almshouses, jails and dungeons mixed with children, the insane and the deaf. These early prisons did not distinguish between prisoners in regard to age, sex, or type of crime, and some consisted of large rooms, privately-owned, where men, women and children lived, ate and slept amidst terrible, unsanitary conditions, without protection from physical or sexual abuse. One contemporary observer described such a prison as " a scene of promiscuous and unrestricted intercourse, and universal riot and debauchery."[2] With the spread of prison reform, came the separation of "women-convicts" into the corners of the institutions emerging as a nationwide system of state prisons. Many of these were patterned after the penitentiary model - - a place for silent contemplation, self-examination, removal from corrupting peers and, under the Auburn System, congregate work by day. For the women especially, whose numbers were low, their separation, without or even with the supervision of a "matron," meant much idleness, since rarely were "moral instruction" or other activities considered feasible. For the system, the low numbers of women led to a perception that they effectively "couldn't carry their own weight," which elicited the recommendation by no less a reformer than Dorothea B. Dix that, because "the product of women's labor in the State prisons fails to meet the expenses of their department," "women-convicts" be sequestered to county houses of correction:

> I should judge it greatly more advantageous in all respects, to sentence women-convicts to the county houses of correction, rather than connect their prisons, with those of the men-convicts, especially also if their numbers are so few that it is judged inexpedient to appoint a matron.[3]

b. Sexual segregation of offenders. After nearly a century of arguments by reformers in favor of classification of prisoners by age, sex, and offense history, efforts at reform reached a fever pitch in 1870 at the National Congress on Penitentiary and Reformatory Discipline, where complaints were voiced about the unconscionable idleness of prisoners, reports of brutality, and the mixing of women, children, and hard-core male convicts.[4] As a result, the last quarter of the nineteenth century witnessed the beginning of a movement to build separate women's prisons on the penitentiary model, to provide protection for the women from the assaults of male guards; to encourage development of special programs for women; to foster independence in women, by giving them total responsibility for maintaining the institution and its proximate farmland; and, in general, to isolate women criminals from the chaos of the outside world. The first separate prison for women, the Indiana Women's Prison, opened in 1873. Other jurisdictions followed suit: Framingham, Massachusetts opened in 1877; a reformatory for women in New York in 1891; Westfield Farm in 1901; and the institution for women at Clinton, New Jersey, in 1913. Reform was spurred by many influential women in the suffrage movement, whose personal experiences with prisons and jails helped them understand the situation of women prisoners. The trend toward separate state institutions for women continued until 1971, when the first coed institution opened, at which time there were approximately thirty-four separate state institutions for women. Many of these prisons retained an "un-prisonlike," "bucolic," "commodious" atmosphere, and their physical plants -- often groups of houses or cottages situated in apparently idyllic surroundings -- sometimes strike visitors as more like small New England colleges than prisons.

After several generations of sexually segregating inmates, male and female prisoners have been recently regarded as subject to differential treatment because of two factors: the vast differences in facilities for each sex, due to scale differences between male and female institutions; and stereotypical assumptions about the different security and rehabilitative problems male and female offenders present. Consequently, although women's facilities may strike a visitor as less "forbidding" than men's facilities, this represents only one aspect of the differential effect of the dual system. In a summary assessment of the differential effect of the dual system, Arditi states that women are disadvantaged by remoteness, heterogeneity, and low program facility level; men by harsh physical surroundings, lower staff/inmate ratios, and a strict regime; both males and females by being treated according to sex-role stereotypes.[5] In addition to the more visible differences between male and female facilities, administrators and researchers have noted the tendency in male prisons for a "macho," confrontational atmosphere to develop, while in female prisons an institutional version of family dependency roles sometimes emerges. The provision of a heterosexual milieu might be viewed as a way of counteracting the development in single-sex institutions of caricatures of traditional sex-role stereotypes.

c. Other precedents. The concept of interaction between the sexes in correctional situations did not "rise out of the ashes" after a century of smouldering disuse. Several juvenile homes have operated as coeducational, and in fact retained strong public support. In the early 1960's, U.S. Public Health Service drug treatment hospitals experimented with coed rehabilitation programs. Furthermore, occasional coed dances and other social functions, as well as educational programs, commonly occurred between nearly male and female institutions, including those which operated as "brother-sister" institutions on the same grounds.

2. Early co-correctional models. The emergence of the first coed institutions in

both Federal and State systems was pervaded by an improvisatory atmosphere, and an inevitable level of tentativeness, even if a "confident tentativeness," because "there was no book of rules to go by."

a. Federal system. In July 1971, after a prolonged, two-year period of discussion and anticipation, the Kennedy Youth Center in Morgantown, West Virginia - - also then known as FYC-Morgantown - - opened one of its cottages to female offenders. The presence of an over-capacity population at the FCI in Alderson, West Virginia - - which at the time housed most women in the Federal system - - provided the opportunity to implement a program at Morgantown based on the programmatic value of a mixed population. Although Morgantown was meant to house juveniles, and although it reverted to single-sex male status in 1975, it represented the first Federal venture into the field of co-corrections, and encouraged consideration of future program development. Morgantown's coed program closed in 1975 amidst conditions of severe overcrowding, not through general dissatisfaction in the Bureau of Prisons with co-corrections, but for a variety of other reasons, including geographical expanse, lack of parallelism in inmate age distribution by sex, and perceived inadequacy of supervision. After termination of the program, the special problems and importance of operating coed facilities for youthful offender populations in the process of clarifying sex-identity continued to be discussed.

Several months before Morgantown received its first females, the Bureau of Prisons began planning for its take-over of a Public Health Service hospital in Fort Worth, Texas. A task force set up by the Director in early 1971, when HEW officials offered the former "narcotics farm" to the Bureau of Prisons, identified certain needs upon which the mission was to be based: programs for drug abusers and alcoholics, for older men with chronic health problems "rotting behind the walls," and for women, to give relief to the two jammed Federal facilities for women at Alderson and Terminal Island. Other than the "pragmatic needs of the service," no "definitive rationale" existed for this involvement in co-corrections, other than that it was "among the innovations that need to be tried." Program planning for the facility was necessarily improvisatory, and occurred mostly after the institution opened. The opening was preceeded by development of many sets of assumptions, but few systematic expectations about how to manage a co-correctional setting, or what co-corrections might bring. Charles Campbell, the first warden at FCI Fort Worth, has written:

> During the months preceding the activation of the facility in the fall of 1971, we engaged in long hours of cogitation about the problem of how to manage men and women in the same institution. There was no body-of-knowledge to rely on. Thus we knew we would need to proceed cautiously and learn from trial and error. . . we engaged in no systematic theorizing about what might be encountered in a co-correctional experience. Instead, all we had was a shared conviction that different kinds of things needed to be tried.[6]

With the arrival of 45 females from Alderson via Seagoville in November, 1971, the resources for a coeducational program were present. However, these were not women chosen on the basis of the criteria developed during the planning session, that they be "carefully selected, stable, tractable women chosen on the basis of their predicted ability to tolerate the stress of living with rigid constraints in close proximity to men offenders." Rather, their presence was one of the unexpected consequences of the Attica riot. Their movement to Fort Worth came as an aftermath of the riot which occurred at Alderson in September, 1971 in the wake of Attica. Because of the circumstances involved in their transfer, the women were in an extremely hostile frame of mind - - and the careful planning for a highly selected women's population to be phased into integration at Fort Worth was clearly irrelevant. For a brief period the administration questioned the feasibility of integration since, as those present recall, the anger of the women as they left the buses transporting them from Seagoville to Fort Worth, startled both the staff and the male inmates. However, the integration was effected, and the coed program which emerged included interaction in the yard, which was closely supervised, in the dining hall, most classes, evening rec hall, and certain other recreational activities. An unanticipated result of the Alderson riot and the subsequent forced transfer of the "ring leaders" and other women in disciplinary status, was the discovery that co-corrections did not apparently require the type of "selected" population previously assumed.

What developed during this "founding period" at Fort Worth was a sense of uniqueness and a participation in the development of a "new" corrections. It has been characterized as "the times of peace and love." One staff member suggested that "a lot of staff blood went into the ground out there. When you want to turn an institution on its head, you bring in women, and decentralize it." This initial experience in co-corrections, and the research it generated, brought with it a clearer notion of the problems of implementation as well as the potential benefits.

b. State systems. The Massachusetts Correctional Institution at Framingham - - commonly regarded as the first coed state institution - - exhibited the same tentativeness about co-corrections, as did Fort Worth. Although staff "foreboding" about co-corrections was quelled by the satisfactory operation of a previously troubled institution, the formation of day-to-day procedures and operations was an improvised process. As one staff member explained, "It's kind of new and it's a baby and you feel your way. If you goof, you go back, and then you go on." While MCI Framingham was not quite the first contemporary state institution to house both sexes, it shared with Fort Worth the reputation of being among the most "successful," and has been certainly among the most "renowned," or "visible," coed prisons. In March 1973, almost one hundred years after its founding, Framingham introduced male inmates to one of the facility's four units. The occasion for "going coed" was a significant under-utilization of space at Framingham - - the state's female offender population had dropped to well below half-capacity in an institution with a capacity of about 150 - - and concomitant high per capita costs, and concurrent overcrowding in the state's facilities for males. Some consideration was given to wholly abandoning the use of Framingham for women offenders - - at about the same time that the nearby state of Connecticut contemplated developing arrangements to transfer its women to Framingham - - but this question was resolved in favor of co-corrections.

c. Exemplar institutions. The general success of these early ventures into co-corrections undoubtedly assuaged the fears and reluctance toward "going coed" in certain other jurisdictions. The influence of Fort Worth and Framingham is made apparent by the fact that representatives from the other eight coed institutions and/or from their Central Offices, site-visited one or both, either before or during implementation at their own institutions. In some cases the visitors reacted to certain aspects of the programs at Fort Worth and Framingham: commenting on the extent of physical contact as well as the potential threat posed by "intermingling" among inmates on families "outside." But in spite of these misgivings, these institutions demonstrated that co-corrections was manageable, and with modifications to allow for local sensitivities, and other adjustments, might be implemented in a wide variety of institutions. As the co-correctional concept was implemented in other institutions, prospective co-correctional administrators also looked to them for guidance, especially the previously all-male, minimum-security, education-oriented institution at Vienna, Illinois, and the FCI in Lexington, Kentucky, which opened as a co-correctional institution.

B. The Spread of Co-corrections

1. Planning for co-corrections. Such site-visits by institutional or jurisdictional staff have commonly comprised a major component of planning. In one state, four coed facilities were visited by institutional or jurisdictional staff; in another, the superintendent had a long-standing interest in co-corrections and visited Fort Worth once and Framingham several times. But besides such visitations, there was little prior planning for co-corrections. Some jurisdictions reported some preparation in the form of memos and conversations between administrators, but rarely were the potential implications of the coeducational program upon operations systematically considered. In one state institution, the superintendent explicitly stated the intention to "establish control as we went along;" the many policy changes in most institutions may partially reflect a similar intent to deal with problems or unforeseen difficulties as they arise. While to some degree a programmatic function for the male-female presence and interaction ordinarily was perceived before implementation at the institutional and/or jurisdictional level, the actual integration has often struck - - seemingly without warning - - when required by immediate necessity. The Federal system has exhibited more overall capability for, and interest in, planning and has held several Wardens Conferences on Co-corrections for current and past administrators and program managers of coed institutions. One Federal coed institution opened with a warden who had served as an Associate Warden at Fort Worth; a second Federal institution - - the only coed institution which had not been either a single-sex prison or served another prior purpose - - received staff three months before inmates, allowing the opportunity for both heightened levels of anticipation and some measure of planning.

2. Precipitating factors. The most frequently-cited occasions for the establishment of co-corrections have been the under-utilization of a jurisdiction's facilities for one sex and/or overcrowding in facilities for the opposite sex, and the need to increase the cost-effectiveness of program delivery to one or both sexes. Although the specific manner of implementation has varied - - the introduction of males to a women's state institution, of females to a male institution, of both sexes to a new facility or a facility previously used for other correctional or non-correctional purposes, or the integration of coordinate institutions - - these circumstances for the emergence of co-corrections have nearly universal application.

a. Federal system. In the Federal system, all four coed FCI's began operations with both sexes. However, one of these operated with coordinate facilities - -a men's division and a women's division. Although some joint programs occurred on occasion, while less legitimate contact flowed from inmate ingenuity, regular interaction between the sexes has only recently begun to be allowed. As previously mentioned, the need to expand facilities because of population increases, and in particular to add regional facilities for women, played a part in the Federal decision regarding the three institutions which opened as coed. In two instances the ready availability of HEW-owned facilities triggered the decision, and in the third case plans to open a male youth facility were modified before construction was completed. All four FCI's anticipated the opportunity to deliver certain special program services in a more cost-effective manner through co-correctional operations -- including programs for the aged and chronically ill, youth populations, substance abusers, and women -- although in the case of the previously coordinate institution, interest in co-corrections came about "to reduce duplicate functions, to save some positions, and thus to allow movement into functional units out of complement, as tasked by the Bureau. It was expected to be more economical." In addition, movement of at least three of the Federal institutions into co-corrections was influenced by an interest in extending to them the normalizing effects previously experienced elsewhere.

b. State systems. Of the fifteen state coed institutions identified and listed in Table 1, seven were previously the single institution for women in the state, four were men's institutions, and four had served other correctional or non-correctional purposes. Only three of the institutions began as coed: two of these contain a markedly low representation of the minority sex; a third, which is still in the process of opening, contains a small "trial" population of equal numbers of both sexes, although the long-term women's populaion is expected to be relatively low, once renovations at the women's institution have been completed. To six of the seven institutions which were originally female, males were introduced to better utilize available space and for a variety of subsidiary reasons: provision of minimum-security facilities for infirm or aging males; provision of work- and study- release options for younger males; anticipated reduction of the need for civilian "heavy" labor; to increase the cost-effectiveness of, and thereby save marginal programs; and, in one institution, to provide a relaxed environment for conducting of an experimental project for youthful male offenders, while also training staff for a new coed institution in the state formerly scheduled to open in 1976. The seventh institution became coed when plans to transfer selected minimum security women to an existing all-male institution, which was scheduled for coed use, were complicated by the inability to find alternate placements for women who did not fit the criteria for minimum-security status. These women remained behind with the newly introduced male population after the institution was to have been converted to all-male use, and provided the nucleus for an unplanned coed program.

The sexual integration of the eight state institutions which were not formerly all-female involved space utilization in a less obvious manner. In at least three cases, the state's female offender population was so small that the maintenance of a separate facility was considered unwarranted, especially if service delivery was to be at a reasonable level. Two of these states were in the process of "bringing our women home" -- one from out-of-state institutions to which they had been contracted, and a second from a more distant city. A fourth institution, as already mentioned, became coed as part of a plan to release the women's institution which was underutilized for all-male occupation, and also because the new coed institution for women offered a minimum security atmosphere and a wide range of vocational and educational programs unavailable

TABLE 1

CONTEMPORARY COEDUCATIONAL CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

		Institution	Location	Implementation date
	**	FYC-Morgantown	Morgantown, West Virginia	July, 1971
*		FCI-Fort Worth	Fort Worth, Texas	November, 1971
		Muncy State Correctional Institution	Muncy, Pennsylvania	December, 1971
*		Massachusetts Correctional Institution	Framingham, Massachusetts	March, 1973
*		FCI-Lexington	Lexington, Kentucky	February, 1974
	**	Dwight Correctional Center	Dwight, Illinois	May, 1974
*	**	Vienna Correctional Center	Vienna, Illinois	May, 1974
*		FCI-Pleasanton	Pleasanton, California	July, 1974
*		Correctional Institution for Women	Clinton, New Jersey	August, 1974
	**	Claymont Institution for Women	Claymont, Delaware	October, 1974
	**	Metropolitan Training Center	Circle Pines, Minnesota	March, 1975
*		FCI-Terminal Island	Terminal Island, California	March, 1975
*		Taycheedah Correctional Institution	Taycheedah, Wisconsin	July, 1975
*	**	Connecticut Correctional Institution	Niantic, Connecticut	September, 1975
*		Renz Correctional Center	Cedar City, Missouri	September, 1975
		Chittenden Community Correctional Center	South Burlington, Vermont	January, 1976
		Maine Correctional Center	South Windham, Maine	April, 1976
		North Idaho Correctional Institution	Cottonwood, Idaho	May, 1976
		Memphis Correctional Center	Memphis, Tennessee	April, 1977
		Westville Correctional Center	Westville, Indiana	August, 1977

* Site-visited

** Phased-out

at the state's institution for women. Women were introduced to a fifth institution to "bring them closer to home," to better utilize available space in a men's minimum security prison, and to extend the concept of unit management to females. A sixth institution, a men's honor farm, became coed on five hours notice, after prolonged planning and discussion, when the overcrowding at the state female institution reached emergency proportions, culminating in a riot, and a segment of the women was transferred to the men's institution; a continued need for more facilities and services for the state's female offender population, and the apparent success of the coed program over the period of a year, led to the decision to transfer in the remainder of the female population, and retain only enough males to work the farm. A seventh coed institution was viewed as an interim measure required by population pressures. An eighth institution opened as coed when a programmatic interest in the concept developed simultaneous with the need for alternate placements for female offenders, especially during renovation of the women's facility.

3. Expansion of co-corrections. The proliferation of co-correctional institutions may have been aided in part by the recommendations of the previously mentioned National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. While no visited institution mentioned these standards as a reason for "going coed," the Standards and Goals Commission did provide an additional "airing" of the idea of co-corrections to the criminal justice community, which was becoming increasingly interested in the concept. The co-correctional universe expanded rapidly during the next two years after the Commission made its recommendations - - 1974 and 1975 - - and the implementation of co-corrections was generally preceeded in a given jurisdiction by carefully scrutinizing the concept as a programmatic strategy, although the actual move into co-corrections was often precipitated by a situation unrelated to co-corrections as a programmatic concept.

a. Rapid spread. Until 1974, the co-correctional institution remained a rarity. Only three institutions contained both sexes and permitted their interaction, and one of these had a relatively insignificant number of the minority sex. In 1974, however, began a great increase in the number of coed facilities, which continued through 1975, after which the pace of sexual integration of prisons slowed. Eleven of the twenty institutions identified as coed began operations for both sexes in 1974 or 1975. Table 1 contains a list of all current and former coed institutions, starting with FYC Morgantown, and the date co-corrections was implemented. The coed institutions contained in Table 1 do not represent a uniform program structure. Some of the institutions only marginally fit the definition of co-corrections used in this study, either because they were "specialized institutions," or because the level of minority sex representation was so low as to be nearly "invisible." While each of these borderline institutions qualified as "coed" according to the operational definition of co-corrections contained in Chapter I, their actual "level of integration" - - in terms of sex ratio balance, parity of both the age range and distribution between the sexes, mixture of the sexes in programs, and equality of security levels for both sexes - - tended to be low. Of the two site-visited institutions which have been phased-out, Vienna was visited while the phase-out was being effected but before the last of the females were either paroled or sent back to Dwight; Niantic was visited after the program had been temporarily suspended, and a second male contingent and a new staff for the male unit introduced to the institution.

b. Current co-correctional population. Despite the relatively small number of co-correctional institutions now in existence, a significant percentage of the female offender population and, disregarding an apparent reversal of trends, a growing number of male offenders in the United States are incarcerated in such facilities. Recent compilations by the Bureau of Prisons show that 997 females and 2077 males, or that 58.1 percent of female and 7.5 percent of male Federal prisoners, occupy coed institutions. Using the data on inmate populations obtained in this study, it can be calculated that 1232 females and 1277 males are in state coed institutions, which represents 9.7 percent of the female and .53 percent of the male state prison population.[7] Thus almost twenty percent of all offenders in Federal and one percent in state prisons occupy coeducational correctional institutions. The following chapter describes life in these institutions.

IV. CHARACTERISTICS OF CO-CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Among the basic interests of practitioners and other decision-makers either contemplating implementation of co-correctional programs, or the modification or termination of ongoing programs, have been questions about "how others do it," "how others have been affected by shifts in philosophy or changes in policy," and "what changes other jurisdictions anticipate." This Chapter describes visited institutions in terms of certain key characteristics, describes changes in these characteristics occurring over time, and describes potential future developments in the area.

A. Characteristics of Existing Institutions

At the point-in-time when ten selected coed institutions were site-visited, a wide range of institutional characteristics was displayed. This section presents a "snap shot" of these institutions in terms of five categories: facility, inmates, staff, programs, and policy. Each of these categories is further differentiated into other factors. Except where noted, the discussion is confined to visited institutions. Table 2 summarizes the ranges and means for selected characteristics.

1. Facility.

a. Rated capacity. Visited institutions ranged from approximately 150 in two state institutions, to over 1,000 in one Federal institution. Among unvisited institutions were three rated at either under, or slightly above, 100.

b. Security level. All the institutions were either minimum- or medium-security. Institutions varied widely, however, in the degree to which the level of physical security - - locked gates, mass lighting, number of fences - - corresponded to what may be associated with the nominal security level.

c. Physical plant. The ten institutions included some of the oldest and newest prisons in the country: the oldest state institution opened in 1877 and the newest in 1965; the oldest Federal institution was completed in 1934 and the newest received its first inmates in 1974. They ranged from small facilities with only a few buildings to sprawling complexes with a dozen or more buildings on hundreds or even thousands of acres. Eight of the ten facilities formerly operated farms, and two of these still functioned as full-scale farms. Architectural modifications to accomodate a two-sex population were limited. Self-enclosed units or buildings were generally given over *in toto* to new arrivals, although in some cases partitioning was added. Buildings were modified or refurbished in at least five institutions, generally to make a building more "liveable" or to convert a space previously used for other purposes. In at least one case, a minimum-security cottage was made more secure to accept medium-security males.

d. Inmate quarters. Male and female inmates lived in physically separate housing - - either different buildings, or in cottages - - at each of the state and one of the Federal institutions. In one of the Federal institutions, most of the women lived on what was virtually a separate compound, and in the two other Federal institutions inmates lived in a combination of separate coed and single-sex buildings, and in a series of connected buildings facing on a common yard. Actual inmate living space included

TABLE 2

CHARACTERISTICS OF COEDUCATIONAL CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Characteristics	Mean	Range	
		Low	High
inmate population	437	131	1041
# male inmates	286	13	858
# female inmates	151	24	421
inmate sex ratio	5/1	3/2 M/F 3/1 F/M	20/1 M/F 9/1 F/M
staff size	203	55	330
staff-inmate ratio	1/2	1/1	1/4
custody staff size	100	30	195
custody-inmate ratio	2/9	1/2	1/8
budget	$3,658,900	$681,000	$7,264,200
Per capita costs	$10,676	$3,683	$14,432

private rooms, semi-private rooms, open dorms, several types of cubicles, and make-shift space in the halls. With a few exceptions, the two sexes received similar quarters. Women may have been more crowded than men due to recent shifts in sex-ratios, but efforts to provide a greater degree of privacy to women wherever possible - - private or semi-private rooms, or at least cubicles - - were generally evident.

e. Budgets and per capita costs. Budgets for 1976 ranged from $681,000 to $7,264,200. However, five of the ten operated on a budget between 3 and 5.5 million dollars in 1976. Eight institutions spent from approximately $9,000 to $14,500 per year on each inmate, and four of these spent between ten and twelve thousand dollars per capita. State institutions varied from $3,683 to $14,432 on per capita expenditure; Federal institutions from $6,327 to $14,327 per capita. Only one institution had at any time received LEAA funds directly for co-corrections.

2. Inmates.

a. Population size. The size of the ten coed institutions ranged from 131 at a former state women's institution to 1041 (and rising) at a Federal facility. Four state institutions held fewer than 200 inmates; one state and one Federal approximately 300, one state and one Federal slightly over 500, and two Federal held over a thousand. The Federal institutions were generally regarded as over-capacity, while state institutions were either at, or under-capacity, even though inmates of one sex or the other might have been over-capacity. State institutions were under-capacity because either certain buildings had fallen into disuse, or admissions of inmates of one sex were insufficient to utilize the space which continued to be allocated to that sex, or the security level of one sex prevented the level of space utilization possible were it occupied by the opposite sex.

b. Sex ratios. Sex ratios ranged from nine females to one male at a former state women's institution, to twenty males to one female at a state institution where the co-correctional program was being phased-out. However, the populations at seven of the ten contained fewer than four of the majority sex to one of the minority. Three of the facilities - - all Federal - - had sex ratios which approached one male to one female. Four state institutions maintained ratios of from three to four females to each male. Populations at unvisited institutions were disproportionately of one sex.

c. Selection criteria. Among the selection criteria used in existing co-correctional institutions were the following: inmate choice; nature of referral; age; time-in-sentence status; clean record in previous institutions; history of non-violence and low escape potential; absence of sexual assault history; absence of gang leadership history; security level; first offender status; proximity to geographical release point; presence/absence of relatives at the institution; capability to perform special work details; interest in further training; eligibility for special unit programs; eligibility for community programs; cognitive test performance; personal interview indications of "readiness." It should be noted, however, that distinctions between formal and informal, or official and "casual" criteria, are often blurred; moreover, that exceptions are often made on either a case-by-case basis (as in the circumstance of some protection cases) or for an entire group (such as Youth Act females, who often fall below the age cut-off intended by some institutions). Distinctions need to be made between the applicability of criteria in state and Federal systems differentially for males and females.

Because five out of six state institutions housed the entire incarcerated female population in the given state, selection criteria in these institutions really applied only to males, except insofar as differences existed between institutional capabilities for handling unsentenced females. The one institution located in a jurisdiction which provided placement options for women applied essentially the same criteria to both sexes: that they be minimum-security, eligible for programs and have no history of gang leadership; volunteering was still a criterion for males, but had probably been eroded as a criterion for females, who unlike males were subject to an additional interview to determine "readiness;" consideration also was given to whether males were from that region of the state. The most frequent criteria for males at the other five state institutions were inmate choice, nature of referral, a clean record at previous institutions, a history of non-violence, and minimum-security status. Four out of five stipulated that male inmates express an interest in, or volunteer for, co-corrections; have minimum-security status; and be referred from other institutions, although in the case of at least one coed institution, transfers included those who had only undergone reception and diagnosis elsewhere. Three out of five required a clean record at previous institutions, and a demonstrated history of non-violence and low escape potential (at least as an adult).

Other selection criteria have less widespread application, or were more difficult to identify. Two out of five institutions directly restricted the age of male admissions: one to males over 50, and the other to males under 22. At least two other institutions indirectly restricted the age of male admissions: one by requiring that males be first offenders, and the other by primarily admitting males who had served several years on life sentences to serve as a special work detail. At least one institution required the absence of sexual assault history, but one institution openly received sex offenders. One institution required that a prospective inmate have no relatives already at the institution (which really only applied to spouses), but a second institution attempted to transfer-in spouses who were located elsewhere in the state system. Two institutions required eligibility for community programs, and at least two (probably more) the capability to perform special work details. At least one institution required that only inmates with less than a specified length of time remaining on their sentences could be admitted; a second required first offender status; a third, an interest in "further training," although the institution had no identifiable training to offer; and a fourth, cognitive test performance, as the basis for admission into a special unit program. At least two required an additional interview to determine "readiness for co-corrections." Other factors may have played into the process of inmate selection in a more subtle manner, such as proximity to geographical release point, recommendations from "friends of the superintendent" at other institutions, and the general appearance of an inmate's file. Some institutions provided for alternate criteria, e.g., an inmate not qualifying for community-release programs may be admitted based on capabilities in the performance of special work details.

Although the criteria above also applied to the unvisited institutions, certain criteria appear to have been more frequently used, such as inmate age and ability to perform specified work details: two institutions restricted male admissions to an older, more tractable population capable of heavy labor; and two other institutions only admitted younger males, with one of them further specifying that they be first offenders. With two exceptions, the unvisited institutions housed the entire incarcerated female population in the jurisdiction: one housed women who were considered unsuitable for the state's minimum-security coed institution discussed above, and the other gave preference to women from the region of the state in which the prison is located.

In the Federal system, some selection criteria differ between institutions, and generally apply differently to males and females. Inmate choice appeared to be significant in at least three institutions, although choice was less applicable to women who were more frequently direct commitments from the courts. Age cut-offs were wider for females than for males: the cut-off was lower for females at three institutions, and higher at another institution which housed a youthful offender population. Time-in-sentence guidelines tended to be applied more liberally regarding females, who either exceeded the two-year restriction nominally present in at least three of the four institutions, or were directly sentenced to the institution for periods of only a few months. Two of the four institutions required minimum-security status and eligibility for community release programs. Two required eligibility for special unit programs, and at one institution this was an alternate admissions criterion. Three encouraged the transfer-in of spouses incarcerated at other Federal institutions. Proximity to geographical release point was a general consideration for admission to all four institutions, but was applied less rigorously to females. At least two and as many as four institutions required the absence of a sexual assault history.

3. Staff.

a. Staff size and staff-inmate ratios. Staff size, staff-inmate ratios, and custody-inmate ratios, displayed wide ranges, and did not consistently reflect either jurisdictional norms, or scale differences. Staff size ranged from 55 employees at a state institution housing 197 inmates, to 330 at a state institution which held 290 inmates. In between these extremes, there were three state and one Federal institutions employing from 114 to 140 staff members; one state and two Federal institutions which employed from 230 to 289, and one Federal institution which approached the 330 figure. Staff-inmate ratios ranged from one-to-one, to one-to-four. Four states employed approximately one staff member per inmate; one state and one Federal institution, approximately one staff member for every two inmates; and the remaining one state and three Federal institutions maintained staff-inmate ratios higher than one-to-two, but less than one-to-four. Both the size of security staffs and custody-inmate ratios exhibited even wider variation. Security staffs ranged in size from 30 at the state institution having only 55 total staff, to 195 at a state institution having 285 on its full staff. Four state and two Federal institutions had security staffs under 100, and two state and two Federal institutions between 130 and 195. Custody-inmate ratios ranged from one-to-two to one-to-eight. Five state institutions had custody-inmate ratios of one-to-two or one-to-three, and the other state institution had a ratio of nearly one-to-seven. Custody-inmate ratios at Federal institutions ranged from one-to-four, to one-to-eight.

b. Staff integration. Every institution visited maintained a more-or-less integrated staff, and where an existing institution had "gone coed," additional staff had been hired (especially custody) of the same sex as either the introduced population, or the population which was under-represented on the staff inherited from a non-correctional facility. The sex ratio of staff generally mirrored that of the inmates; however, the composition of staffs, by sex, still generally reflected the traditional composition of the institution as single sex, or predominantly of one sex. At two of the three Federal institutions, which had traditionally (i.e., since opening) been predominantly male, but which recently have housed inmate populations approaching parity, females were under-represented on both total staff and security staff. The integration of staffs, by rank, is more difficult to estimate. It appears that career ladders for women in corrections have not been reduced, and if anything have been enhanced, by co-corrections. However, men rather than women generally hold the top administrative position in the integrated institutions, and, in at least three jurisdictions, a women's population which had been under a female administrator was placed under a male administrator.

c. Staff background and attitudes. The attitudes of staff toward co-corrections, offenders of the opposite sex, staff members of the opposite sex, and corrections in general, were often perceived by administration, staff and inmates as contributing to program success or failure. At least four institutions hired a substantial segment of staff without background in corrections. Two of these were Federal institutions which "inherited" Public Health Service staffs, and at least two others strove for staff "heterogeneity" on the assumption that background in single-sex environments might impede staff functions in a coed environment. At least five institutions hired staff transferred from the jurisdiction's maximum security institutions: at four of these, staff attitudes, presumably retained from "behind the walls," were perceived to have an adverse effect on the program. The varied attitude among staff mirrored those in the larger society: from condoning male aggressiveness toward female inmates to supporting a woman's right to a range of options equally as wide as that offered to the men.

d. Staff in-service training. At least one institution operated staff in-service training focussed on the co-correctional program. Two or three other institutions briefly dealt with co-corrections in institutional orientation programs. In some cases, co-corrections was not viewed as the appropriate focus of training because, in the words of one training officer, "if they need special training to deal with it, they don't belong here." The administrators of several state institutions noted that, because training would necessarily occur after-hours, union stipulations for overtime payments to training program participants provided a disincentive to formulate such programs.

4. Programs.

a. Structured interaction. All visited institutions claimed that all structured programs - - with some qualification - - were sexually integrated. Structured programs consist, in this discussion, primarily of educational programs and work details; unstructured programs are considered below, and include recreation, dining, inmate organizations, chapel, and leisure time. Several factors seemed to limit full integration of structured programs: enrollment ceilings; movement restrictions by time or place; grant stipulations; the association of some programs with single-sex units; conflicting program schedules; inmate pressures; the preponderance of one sex; lack of supervision in an area; and the administrative decision that certain programs should be restricted.

The administrative decision that programs should be restricted has been occasionally articulated in terms of "the need to shelter" certain programs to inmates of one sex (who were in a minority, or might be pressured out of programs), or special program focus (women's consciousness raising), or "more effective results," or "insufficient resources." Program participation is often curtailed by movement restrictions by time or place, or lack of supervision in an area. In one institution, for example, males were not permitted to work in the kitchen because kitchen workers had to start work before dawn, when movement over the grounds was prohibited, and only those residing in the building which contained the kitchen -- the women -- could reach this work detail without going out-of-doors. Lack of supervision in an area, especially difficult-to-control areas such as warehouses, restricted integration of work details to a degree in all institutions, and women were generally the ones excluded, except where they were in a clear majority. At least one state institution had an enrollment ceiling for the minority sex. In two state institutions, LEAA-funded educational grants restricted the participation of males: one stipulated that funds could be used only for females, and the other required eighty-five percent female participation. An HEW-funded child visitation program at a third institution excluded prospective male participants. In nearly all institutions, some unit-based programs were restricted, by the unit, to a single sex. In at least one institution, where ostensibly "inmates are treated as inmates, and not as male and female," males were precluded from nearly all educational programs and work details -- except for one specialized work detail -- by conflicts between their work schedules and the times when other programs were available. In several institutions, inmate pressures restricted sexual integration, either because one sex "expelled" the other from a program (as was the case in one AA group that had long been all-female, and at two other institutions where the minority population of women seemed generally pressured out of programs), or because older inmates -- most of them male -- were internally pressured against participation in "useless" programs, or because program offerings tend to be unappealing to one sex or the other. Generally, the participation of males and females together in structured programs -- perhaps as peers -- seemed to be at a high level.

b. Unstructured interaction. Restrictions on unstructured interaction between male and female inmates were more pervasive. As noted above, unstructured interaction includes recreation, dining, inmate organizations, chapel, and leisure time. The factors seemingly most related to the level of integration in these areas were: defined adequacy of supervision; association of activities with units; restrictions on movement; and administrative decisions. Restrictions on integration of recreational activities were evident at all institutions, and stemmed from each of these factors. At several institutions, for example, women were restricted from jogging because either supervision was unavailable, or the activity was regarded as too difficult to supervise. At several institutions, movement restrictions by time or place limited integration; for example, men and women swam in different parts of a lake. Five of the ten institutions provided for sexually integrated dining; the other five institutions cited a lack of supervision, administrative decisions against expansion of dining facilities, and unit-based dining, as factors inhibiting the integration of dining, although two of these institutions were planning to integrate the minority sex -- in one case male, and the other female -- into the main mess hall. Three out of four Federal and no more than two of six state institutions provided fully integrated dining. In the fourth Federal institution and in an additional state institution, one women's unit was permitted to dine with the men. At three other state facilities, meals were served on units, at least to the minority population. Primarily due to difficulties in supervision, at least one Federal and three state institutions restricted integration of at least some inmate organizations, particularly inmate offices -- in at least one state only after earlier experimenting with an open-door policy. Chapel was off-bounds, at nearly all institutions, except during services and other structured events, because of its rumored use as a major assignation post.

The level of integration in leisure time activities -- true unstructured time --is difficult to specify, because it involves an estimate of not only the quantity, but also the quality of interaction; by implication, the level of integration in unstructured activities involves the places, times, and circumstances under which interaction is permitted. At one extreme were at least two Federal and one state institutions which encouraged interaction under minimally intrusive supervision, and offered a wide range of settings in which interaction was permitted, including late evening activities such as coffee houses on a daily basis, and even coed swimming in warm weather. At the other extreme were several state and at least one Federal institution, which generally restricted free-time interaction to a physically controlled space, such as the yard, or evening "coed hours" held in a visitor's-type room; or to special occasions, such as dances. In at least two state institutions at the latter extreme, inmates not attending programs occupied a sex-specific domain; this circumstance also existed partially at one Federal institution, where only one of the three women's units was located within the men's domain. This domain was demarcated at one institution by an invisible line passing over the grounds. Males often congregated by a low railing along the end of a path terminating at the dividing line. Several institutions specifically required that at coed activities, such as movies and athletic events, males and females sit in separate parts of the room or field. While it is difficult to quickly quantify the levels of unstructured interaction at a given institution, general impressions about the degree to which opposite sex couples are told to "move on" are gained, and, in general, it seems fair to conclude that only where the male-female interaction was perceived as possessing a programmatic value in itself, was a high level of true unstructured interaction permitted and apparent.

c. Community linkages. Community linkages took two basic forms: programs in which the community provides support to inmates; and public relations efforts emanating from the institution to the outside community. Community programs included education- and work-release, furloughs and day-trips, the presence of inmates as volunteers in the community, and the presence of the outside community and institutional staff as volunteers and co-participants within the institution. Public relations efforts included selectively publicized programs, performances, newsletters, public appearances, and other activities geared to gain or maintain community acceptance for continued political and programmatic viability.

The purposes for community programs included: the maintenance or redevelopment of family ties, primarily through furloughs; learning how to work and recreate again in the community; a means of increasing the sexual integration of the institution, either within the institution through contact with volunteers of the opposite sex, or outside in the community; and, an alternative to sexual activity within the institution. Public relations efforts existed not only to maintain political viability, but also to provide access for the institution to programs available in the community, and to maintain contact with families. Only two Federal and one or two state institutions could be said to operate "thriving" community programs. Other institutions were struggling to either gain or regain access to the community, or to determine what direction the institution would take in the absence of community programs. Most institutions still involved the community in institutional life by receiving volunteers to the institution, especially in educational and religious programs. At least half the institutions visited poured energies into public relations activities to increase access for inmates into the community, build resources, or "stay afloat." In the majority of institutions it was evident that a significant aspect of public relations was providing the "outside world" with assurances about "what's going on in there." Changes in community linkages are detailed below.

d. Medical services. The level of medical services available at the visited institutions seemed comparable to that at non-coed facilities, but is difficult to comment on. It was argued in a few institutions that medical budgets were strained because they were based on long-term projections for a different type of population. Subjects of particular import in coed institutions were: birth control, pregnancy, abortion, and pre-natal care.

Access to birth control for women was found in all the institutions. At only one institution did inmates strongly complain that birth control was difficult to obtain, saying "they turn you inside out and upside down." In most institutions, only birth control pills were generally available, but IUD's were also provided occasionally in some Federal and state institutions. The official rationale for the availability of birth control involved some notion of "protection of the woman's health," and provision of the right to contraception to those on furlough. However, the function of birth control in "regulating the menses" was often not so much the protection of a woman's health as it was the provision of contraception, or as some expressed it, "keeping the menses regular and recurring." Many staff members at the visited institutions regarded that the official purposes for birth control were a "subterfuge," and that the "real reason" was that "we can't be everywhere," and that "every woman has a right to protection." The frequency with which women were prodded to "go on the pill" seemed to vary, but nothing conclusive can be stated about it.

Pregnancy rates, which were distinguished on the basis of institutional and non-institutional sources were readily available at Federal institutions -- perhaps only because they were to be developed for the recent co-corrections conference held by the Bureau -- but were infrequently available in state institutions. State instutions seemed less willing to discuss issues of pregnancy, and careful guidelines and protections on abortions seemed to be lacking in some institutions. Abortions appeared to be available to women at most if not all ten institutions, although the openness with which they were performed, the amount and nature of prior counselling provided, the sources of financial payment, and the services provided to a woman afterwards, varied widely. Pre-natal care was available at all institutions -- indeed, most of the institutions had learned to deal with pregnancies prior to co-corrections -- but the quality of pre-natal care seemed to vary not only respecting the importance with which staff regarded these services, but also in terms of the emotional support provided. As a policy, no institutions regularly allowed babies to remain at the institution with their mothers for a period after birth, although until recently several had permitted it, and certain state institutions had in an earlier generation operated major "mother development" programs. One state institution operated a Title XX Child Visitation Program, but, as mentioned above, funding stipulations allowed children to visit only mothers, and not fathers. However, institutions with furlough policies have arranged for home furloughs to allow for the mother's placement of the child after its birth.

5. Policy.

a. Physical contact. The definition of physical contact policy was widely regarded as a crucial element in the operation of a co-correctional institution. As in most other categories, the ten institutions exhibited a wide range of options in determination of this policy: from not penalizing of any contact short of sexual intercourse, to a prohibition of all physical contact. Two state institutions allowed any behavior "appropriate to public places" to occur, and at these institutions physical contact between inmate couples was evident. The four Federal institutions were affected by the recent efforts to standardize the articulation and implementation of contact policy throughout the Bureau, and only hand-holding and walking arm-in-arm were permitted by policy. The four other state institutions permitted absolutely no physical contact, one such policy specifying that, "any physical contact such as having one's hands on the shoulders of another, legs intertwined or touching, one person resting or leaning on the body of another, etc., will be considered physical contact and subject to a disciplinary charge." However, three of these four no-contact facilities provided certain times during which the rules against contact were suspended: one allowed walking arm-in-arm after church on Sundays, and permitted dances at which inmates perceived that physical contact was encouraged; a second institution permitted occasional dances at which kissing and body contact were condoned; a third institution permitted hand-holding and "accidental" body contact during roller-skating sessions; the fourth institution had only recently "tightened up" its contact policy, and indicated no immediate intention to relax its new policies. Inmates and staff alike at these four institutions commented on their difficulties in adjusting to no-contact rules. All ten institutions stated, with some qualification, that contact policy would be enforced equally with regard to same-sex and opposite-sex contact.

The articulation of contact policy, and the implementation of that policy, are often two different matters. Each institution had its rumors and legends about often-used rendezvous points, times when a room was left empty, couples who had "set up house," and guards who would "look the other way." The implementation of policy was obviously affected by the presence of attitudes among inmates, custody, and other parts of the staff, that "sexual relationships will occur in prison, it is merely a matter of what kind," and that "sexual relationships between men and women are normal and inevitable." These stances were reflected in statements to the effect that, "when you put men and women together they're going to get down, no matter what you do to stop them." Implementation of policy seemed to depend on attitudes, as well as the physical environment: expansiveness, hidden closets, dark corners, etc. Among the Federal institutions, where both articulation and implementation of policy have historically varied, the current level of implementation was still in the process of becoming "coordinated," and inmate evidence of the levels of implementation ranged from the commonly-expressed conviction that, "if you get caught, you're gonna pay," to inmate claims that guards cooperated in planning times and places. At the two relatively "liberal" state institutions, it appeared that sexual contact between a man and a woman, if "discreet," was even condoned. Staff at one of these two state institutions suggested that their policies toward heterosexual contact were an extension of the institution's tolerance of homosexual contact. Although several administrators were adamant in stating that homosexual and heterosexual contact received equal sanctions, a few administrators candidly admitted that "public priorities" demanded focussing on control of heterosexual activity, and it was nearly universal -- with only one strong exception -- that homosexual contact was, in fact, regarded more lightly, even if not as the inmate's "unnatural lot."

b. Sanctions for physical contact. Sanctions for contact policy violations included placement in administrative or disciplinary segregation, exclusion from coeducational activities and interaction with the opposite sex, withdrawal of privileges such as furloughs and release programs, and transfer to single-sex institutions. Distinctions were ordinarily made between major and minor violations, and correspondingly differentiated sanctions commonly applied.

All ten institutions used transfer as the most extreme sanction for contact violations, but there were variations in the uniformity with which this was used. Males at almost all state institutions were ostensibly to be "sent back" for sexual activity or even lesser contact, and the Federal system recently coordinated co-correctional policy to require "sure and swift transfer" for contact violations. Females in coed institutions have been less subject historically to transfer as a disciplinary action for several reasons: five of the six state institutions were the sole facility for incarcerated females in the jurisdiction, and the most extreme sanction available was placement of women in segregation or a higher security status; in the Federal system, women may have represented a "scarce resource" necessary to sustain a co-correctional program; co-corrections could less palpably be presented as a "privilege" to women, who had fewer or no alternatives to co-corrections; and finally, many women were regarded as having problems "in the sexual area."

Indeed, although each Federal and state institution had transferred at least (and in some cases no more than) one male for sexual contact, it was evident that in neither Federal nor state systems have contact policies been rigidly applied to even males, for whom co-corrections could more realistically be presented as a "privilege." Only recently has "sure and swift transfer" echoed throughout the Bureau of Prisons, and its implementation has significantly affected at least one institution where the policy had not been to transfer; because of its location and security level, it had been used as a transfer point, and the options for transfer from the institution were limited.

The Federal system has also emphasized the importance of applying sanctions equally to male and female inmates -- transferring both for sexual contact -- and allowing second chances to both, after a successful term of at least six months has been served at particular single-sex institutions. State institutions also endorsed the concept that a policy of transferring only males can lead to exploitive situations in which a male can be "blackmailed," as well as be subject to potential physical violence to which he would not respond. At least two states offered to transferred males the opportunity to request a "second chance." However, the resources were generally absent in state systems for implementing a policy which would provide "fairer," more equal sanctions -- just as, in the Federal system, the range of options for women is more restricted.

Whether sanctions should be uniformly applied for same-sex and opposite-sex contact was an issue at most institutions. In several institutions, decisions had been openly reached in particular cases to not transfer inmates involved in same-sex contact -- even where alternative placements existed -- on two premises: that such behavior, although potentially threatening the heterosexual atmosphere, did not constitute a violation of "the rule" of co-corrections; and, secondly, that "shipping them out" to a single-sex institution would probably only engender "more of the same." As a result, there appeared to be a tendency to respond to homosexual contact -- regardless of the sex of the participants -- with the same sanctions applied to women in state systems.

c. Movement and space restrictions. As indicated above in the discussions of structured and unstructured interaction, all institutions subjected inmates to certain types of movement restrictions applicable to one or both sexes, either by time or place. The most common were imaginary or actual perimeter lines around cottages and dorms, to be crossed only by either cottage or dorm residents, or by persons of the same sex as residents; restrictions on movement outside of dorms at certain times of the day; restrictions against movement into, or near, certain places, or movement only while under close surveillance; non-overlapping traffic patterns; and the separation of inmates, by sex, into two domains, to be departed only by program participants. Nearly all institutions prohibited movement around opposite sex dorms, and three or four had sex-linked domains. Recent changes in movement restrictions are discussed below.

d. Dating behavior. Federal institutions were more articulate in discouraging "serious" relationships between inmates, at least "long-term serious relationships," and "relationships beyond the confines of the institution." However, only one institution was found to restrict program participation together by "serious" couples, and to require program managers to accordingly screen applicants to their programs. Most institutions stipulated that marriages could occur only between inmates whose acquaintance extended back in time prior to their incarceration. However, at least one state institution had witnessed several inmate marriages which had been highly supported by the institution's administration, and had occasioned nearly institution-wide furloughs for wedding attendance.

B. Changing Co-correctional Characteristics

During the short span of time that modern co-correctional institutions have been in existence, changes have occurred affecting the face -- if not the spirit -- of co-corrections. While the previous section offered a "snap-shot" of coed institutions at the time they were visited, this section attempts to reflect a "moving picture." The changes which have occurred exist against a background dominated by severe overcrowding in many prisons around the country; a sharp surge in the size, if not changes in the characteristics, of the female offender population; and perceived shifts in correctional philosophy, likened to a "swing of the pendulum" by many, away from programmatic strategies and toward "flat-time thinking."

All co-correctional institutions have undergone changes along what may be termed "critical dimensions." However, administrators have been quick to note that such changes have not occurred because the co-correctional setting was necessarily "out-of-control," but primarily as the result of system-level decisions that certain adjustments were required. These changes have, therefore, been often placed under the rubric of "increasing accountability," "just catching up with good correctional practice," or "simply doing what the Director sent me in here to do." In more than one situation, the coed institution was merely seen as disproportionately affected by policy-decisions impacting on all institutions in a given jurisdiction. One phenomenon that has accompanied these changes has been a denial that a programmatic value for co-corrections was ever a consideration in either the development or shaping of the co-correctional program. Instead, co-corrections has been described by administrators at many institutions as a measure which served "the needs of the moment" -- even though system-level planning, as noted above, had involved programmatic considerations at the majority of institutions.

The net results of the changes detailed below appeared to be threefold: first, not only has there been a general increase in the level of control, but also a shift in the perceived locus of control away from peer control, the potential effects of close staff-inmate relationships, the potential "softening" effects of the male-female interaction, and the effects on discipline of program participation, and toward control through the fear of disciplinary action and its effects on parole dates, as well as possible transfer. Moreover, the perception of a state of flux, and the anticipation of yet further changes, have contributed in many circumstances to convictions that "it's haphazard, has no direction," "I don't know what's happening," "it's sick the way they change the rules all the time," and "it's coed in name only." Finally, for those to whom co-corrections represented a program strategy, the changes in correctional climate suggested that, even if, as one unit manager stated, "all the ideas haven't been tried yet," at the same time, "Caution creeps in, and this is what the time calls for. . . In five or six years, we'll be back to more creative strategies."

1. Facility.

a. Security level. While nominal security level changes were limited to two Federal facilities -- one raised to medium- and the other lowered to minimum-security -- the prevailing level of security also increased dramatically at three or four additional state institutions, and less dramatically at other institutions. Hence, without undergoing nominal security level changes, actual security level increases accompanied implementation of a combination of the following: the locking of previously open gates; installation of additional security fences, or an initial one, either as a psychological barrier or to control traffic; use of gatehouses to search visitors and strip-search inmates returning from the community; performance of strip-searches not only upon re-entry and for "probable cause," but "at random;" development of central security systems; installation of mass lighting; use of inmate ID cards; and so on.

b. Inmate quarters. Due to increased levels of overcrowding of one or both sexes, the majority of institutions were being forced to either house some inmates in public areas, or to double- and triple-up inmates in smaller rooms. At least one institution was in the process of making all rooms self-enclosed.

2. Inmates.

a. Population size. Nine out of ten institutions had experienced overall population increases during the previous year; nine had witnessed increases in the female population; five had increases in the male population. The one state institution which showed a slight overall population drop was over-capacity for females, but held only half its male capacity due to a recent cessation of male admissions occurring after access to most community programs was suspended. The sole state institution which evidenced a drop in the female population had intended to decrease this population through attrition, as part of a phase-out and return of the institution to single-sex male status. An additional three state and one Federal institutions showed a decline in the male population, triggered by the surge in female admissions.

b. Sex ratios. As a result of changes in differential rates of admission, at least seven institutions (excluding the one which was phasing-out) have experienced major shifts in sex ratios. Three Federal institutions which had earlier housed three or four males to each female, were moving through increased female admissions toward a balanced sex ratio, and held three males to every two females. Simultaneously the opposite trend was occurring in many state institutions. Four state institutions saw their sex ratios change significantly under the pressure of increased female admissions. The sex ratio flip-flopped from three-to-one, to one-to-three, when one institution became the sole facility for women in the state. In three other state institutions, formerly all-female, the increasing female and decreasing male admissions had shifted sex ratios from an approximation of parity, to a three- or four-to-one ratio disproportionately female.

c. Selection criteria. It is difficult to determine the level to which actual selection criteria have changed over time, and estimates will inevitably understate the frequency with which changes have occurred. Nearly all institutions have undergone relaxation and/or contraction of selection criteria. The one state institution which selected its females reported a general relaxation of criteria in order to maintain the female population level. The three criteria which have been most obviously modified for admission of males to state institutions included: age; eligibility for community programs; and time-in-sentence status. Three institutions had altered age cut-offs: one had gradually eroded its 65-year minimum cut-off, became displeased with its inability to provide programs for younger (thirty year old) males, and reinstated a higher cut-off at 50; a second institution had been unsatisfied with its early experiences with male youth, and retained alternate selection criteria which limited indirectly the numbers of younger males; a third institution had slightly lowered its age cut-off from 26 to 22. Three institutions had also decreased the importance of eligibility for community programs for admission to the institution: at one institution, this became an alternate criterion; and in two other states, those eligible for community programs were removed to other institutions. One state imposed a new time-in-sentence cut-off of eighteen months for those entering as a special work detail, and at a lower point for those soon to be eligible for pre-release status. Another state had experimented with, but ceased, taking protection cases.

In the Federal system, one institution which had previously served as an alleged "catch bag" for the system was in the process of implementing selection criteria, as noted above, including means to screen out those with a history of sexual assault. Major changes in either selection criteria, or the implementation of selection criteria, at other Federal instititions included: inmate choice; nature of referral; age; and time-in-sentence status. Female admissions seemed to show a decrease in voluntary transfers and an increase in direct commitments. The female age cut-off was lowered at one or two instititions (primarily for Youth Act cases), and raised at a third. In general, inmates in Federal coed instititutions seemed to have longer time-in-sentence status than formerly; at the same time, there has been a reported increase in at least one institution of short-term commitments of a few months duration. One institution changed its security level and eliminated eligibility for community programs as an alternate selection criterion, while at the same time making increased exceptions for male protection cases.

3. Staff.

a. Staff-inmate ratios. Staff-inmate ratios appeared to have generally increased, because staff size has not increased in proportion to rises in the inmate population. In Federal institutions, the increase in the staff-inmate ratios is documented, and such shifts reportedly not only decreased staff-inmate relationships, but also meant that "staff is stretched and fights brush fires."

b. Administrative turnover. There had been top administrative turnover -- the departure of the superintendent or warden -- at three Federal and two state institutions since "going coed." These five institutions earlier represented -- and four still represent -- the clearest efforts to operate a coed institution for the outcomes anticipated to flow directly from the male-female interaction. The administrators of all five coed institutions which placed the programmatic aspects of co-corrections in a subordinate position have remained in their positions.

4. Programs.

a. Structured interaction. As noted above, the general level of participation of male and female inmates together in educational programs and work details seemed to be at a high level, despite the presence of factors preventing full integration. Moreover, at each formerly single-sex state institution, the range of available programs had increased, either through development of programs geared to the "minority interest," or through development of new programs by inmates. An example of a program developed through inmate ingenuity existed at one institution, where inmates performed computer programming under contract, and also operated a computer programmer's school for inmates. Two Federal institutions had also for a period of time operated coed therapy units where men and women were involved in fully-integrated therapy programs.

The trend in structured programs seemed to be strongly toward increased integration. Few programs were any longer "sheltered" for one sex. An increase in movement restrictions had a major negative effect on the number of hours programs were accessible in only one institution, and even there programs were increasingly accessible to women in close-security. Moreover, at the previously mentioned institution which indirectly excluded males from most programs by scheduling programs at times when males were obliged to be "on the farm," the range of programs available to males was still higher than before the introduction of females and the expansion of programs which followed their arrival. Where grant stipulations restricted the participation of males, efforts were being made to re-negotiate follow-on grants to allow male participation. Aside from the inhibitions on program participation resulting from restrictions on movement, and the continued exclusion of one sex from certain unsupervised work details, two factors seemed to most strongly limit participation in structured programs: first, the presence/absence, and level of, financial incentives; second, pressures arising from the inmate body and staff, or emanating from within an inmate, which required such an exclusion.

b. Unstructured interaction. Whether changes in unstructured interaction are considered to have occurred over time depends strongly on time-frames. Early coed institutions may have "tended toward conservatism" initially, and only later increased the opportunities for interaction outside of programs. If recent trends only are considered, two positive trends emerge: a general increase in all Federal and in at least two state institutions in the integration of recreation; and, a general increase in the integration of dining. Not enough information was available to suggest trends for inmate organizations. Chapel is commonly one of the first areas to become off-bounds except when being used "officially." In at least four state and two Federal institutions, the opportunities for leisure time interaction had been decreased by movement restrictions (perimeter lines around units and cottages; restrictions on movement after evening count; dismissal by unit from "drill hall;" physical or psychological barriers); the manner in which custody has implemented contact policy regulations; and the abolition of certain programs, such as cottage visitation. In conclusion, it appeared that the ten visited coed institutions have generally moved away from leisure time integration, and toward relatively structured types of "unstructured" activity. More recently emerging coed institutions have, at least initially, conformed to the trend away from integration of leisure time activity.

c. Community linkages. The extent of community programming for inmates in coed institutions has recently decreased sharply in at least six institutions, and has at best "held its own" elsewhere. Three institutions decreased the level of participation in community programs by transferring inmates eligible for such programs to other facilities: one state and one Federal institution transferred male and female inmates to community-based facilities; another state transferred males to a smaller facility. Three other institutions experienced decreases in the level of participation in community programs due to a partial decrease in accessibility to the community: two state institutions ran up against "breakdowns in communication" with nearby community colleges, in both cases focusing on the readiness, or lack thereof, of the selected inmates for such programs. At one of these institutions, long-established community-release criteria had reportedly been modified to meet stipulations of an LEAA-funded grant for the level of female participation, and females who "didn't even know yet what it was to be locked up" were surprised to find themselves released to the community. A third state institution was affected by a jurisdictional re-definition of work- and study-release criteria, which not only deprived three quarters of the inmate body of eligibility, but also involved suspension of furloughs for all inmates in the state system for a period of three months. Reflecting on the potential importance of a "liberal" environment for an open co-correctional program, a former staff member from this institution stated: "once the conservative view of furloughs and release developed, the co-correctional model had to change. I don't know if you can have co-corrections in a conservative model - - without aggressive community programs." The issue of the indispensability of community programs for co-corrections remains unresolved; the trend away from community programs for coed prisons is strong, but may be complemented by an increase in the number of coed community-based programs. Many coed prisons have recently stepped-up public relations activities to provide a basis for re-negotiating relationships with skeptical communities, or, in at least one case, to defend itself against charges by community officials (who were coming up for re-election) that it was "becoming more and more a prison."

5. Policy.

a. Physical contact. Major changes were evident in either the articulation or implementation of physical contact policy, among both state and Federal institutions. Within the Federal jurisdiction, contact policy in coed institutions has, as discussed above, recently been coordinated Bureau-wide, and permits only hand-holding and walking arm-in-arm. However, most administrators would be quick to note that, even if policy has been articulated in a different manner, policy itself has not changed. What has changed is "the level of implementation," "the priority of implementation," or "the expectation of implementation of policy." Only two states had undergone clear policy changes on physical contact, and both were operating under no-contact rules. One state had moved from a period of allowing "prolonged embraces" in public and of reportedly low implementation of strictures against sexual activity and toward strict enforcement of a no-contact policy, occurring within a broader context of "re-alignment" and "re-affirming boundaries." In a second state, staff took the position that "the one new rule" needed to accomodate a major contingent of the opposite sex was a no-contact rule; however, administration asserted that only a re-affirmation of already existing, unwritten rules against physical contact between inmates was necessary. In the other four states, changes in either policy or its implementation were not evident.

The increased implementation of contact policy between persons of the opposite sex has been offered, by both inmates and staff, as a factor leading to increased homosexuality. However, other factors have also been cited: decreases in the representation of the minority sex; increased numbers of protection cases who are known homosexuals; decreased leisure time contact; increased movement restrictions; and, increased public tolerance of homosexuality.

b. Sanctions for physical contact. The Federal institutions have recently begun to operate in accord with newly coordinated policy on physical contact violations which, as noted above, requires transfer for sexual activity, and the application of sanctions regardless of sex. At least two states have re-affirmed an intent to transfer males for sexual activity and two states have explored the availability of alternate placements, including local jails, which would permit the sanction of transfer to be applied more equally.

c. Movement and space restrictions. As noted above, nearly all institutions have recently increased restrictions over movement and use of space. At the simplest level, this has meant drawing a perimeter line around dorms to restrict entry, or inside courtyards to "keep people out of hidden corners." A clear trend exists toward the use of increased movement restrictions, and, to a lesser degree, the allocation of certain spaces to one sex.

C. The Future of Co-corrections

Although the previous section details changes in co-correctional institutions over time, it may not convey the feelings of tentativeness, and even insecurity, which were present at the inception, and during the continuation, of many co-correctional institutions. This section considers the extent of current planning for further implementation of co-corrections, and problems associated with phasing-out.

1. Anticipated implementations. Communications with state correctional agencies identified eight states or other jurisdictions which were planning coed institutions. Three of these appeared to be in the operational planning stage, and five considered co-corrections part of a long-range plan. Of the three institutions which were at the operational planning stage, one has recently "gone coed" by introducing its first contingent of women; a second will soon open (after several months of delay in acquiring a non-correctional facility); and a third state has cancelled plans to add males to the sole women's institution in the state, due to increases in the female offender population, which have eliminated the problem of sub-maximal space utilization. The plans in at least two of the other five jurisdictions have been affected by difficulties in obtaining

sufficient funds: one state, which had originally planned to build a modern co-correctional facility to open in 1976, has "indefinitely" pushed back its target date to 1981; a second jurisdiction has, in the absence of funds for architectural modifications and program expansion, tabled its plan. Two other jurisdictions have retained co-corrections as part of a long-range plan, and one state was found to be exploring the potential impacts of pending equal rights legislation on the obligation to integrate all public institutions, including prisons.

An emerging trend in states which have recently opened, or plan to open, coed facilities is the maintenance of single-sex placement options for females, as well as for males. One state which recently opened a coed facility is planning the construction of a second facility for women; another recently-opened state facility brought some of the women in the state "closer to home," but still allows women the choice of single-sex incarceration elsewhere in the state; a third state, soon to open its coed facility, will continue to permit women the alternative of single-sex incarceration which has generally been retained, in other jurisdictions operating coed facilities, only for men.

2. Phasing-out. Despite the relatively short history of co-corrections, six co-correctional facilities -- counting the Kennedy Youth Center in Morgantown, West Virginia -- have gone out of existence. Table 3 lists the institutions which have ceased to be co-correctional (temporarily in one case), projected program terminations, and actual or projected dates of termination. The reason for termination of co-corrections mentioned in five out of six institutions was the prospect for greater space utilization through a different distribution of the inmate population. In one jurisdiction, a temporary suspension had occurred solely for program-related purposes unrelated to co-corrections; in a second jurisdiction, programmatic considerations about co-corrections were more influential in termination than space problems; in two institutions, programmatic considerations were subordinate to the need to utilize available space more effectively. In two other jurisdictions, co-corrections was viewed primarily as an interim measure to permit maximal use of space. The effects of population pressure have also been cited as the primary motivation for projected program terminations.

The discontinuation of co-corrections has involved several modes of "disassembly," and has brought in its wake entirely new sets of circumstances. The general disassembly pattern has been, as one would expect, the return of the more recently introduced population to its original, or another, single-sex institution. In one case, this involved a partial "exchange" of minority-sex populations, as well as re-distribution of males throughout the state system, and the release of others of both sexes. Early parole has been utilized to avoid transfer back to a single-sex environment of persons who had successfully adjusted to a coed environment. One state removed its female population from its formerly all-female institution, after a brief and "morale-raising" experiment with co-corrections as an interim measure to better utilize space, and nearby opened a smaller women's facility.

Accompanying or following the termination of co-corrections several problems have occurred or been anticipated which, though not unknown under co-corrections, were exacerbated by its discontinuation, including: problems of control resulting from the separation of steady couples; general animosity among the remaining sex caused by the loss of the presence of the opposite sex; resentment by the transferred sex of being

TABLE 3

TERMINATED COEDUCATIONAL CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Institution	Location	Date
Claymont Institution for Women	Claymont, Delaware	May, 1975
Kennedy Youth Center	Morgantown, West Virginia	July, 1975
Connecticut Correctional Institution	Niantic, Connecticut	May, 1976*
Metropolitan Training Center	Circle Pines, Minnesota	May, 1976
Dwight Correctional Center	Dwight, Illinois	May, 1977
Vienna Correctional Center	Vienna, Illinois	June, 1977
FCI Pleasanton	Pleasanton, California	January, 1978**
FCI Terminal Island	Terminal Island, California	January, 1978**

* re-started September, 1976

** projected termination

"pulled out;" the "unfairness" of sending an inmate to a stricter institution than his or her behavior has warranted; and, the loss of access to potentially beneficial programs. At the same time, the reversion to single-sex status has elicited the comment by some inmates and staff that, "now things are back to normal." Another state institution anticipated host of management problems which were not forthcoming, because inmates apparently welcomed the scaling-down of security which accompanied withdrawal from co-corrections. However, the one state which converted its former women's institution to a male institution, after a brief interval of co-corrections, has subsequently experienced an increase in female commitments of a magnitude which not only would have allowed the use of the former women's institution to capacity, but also has pushed the current women's institution beyond double-capacity.

The near future may see the further proliferation of co-correctional institutions but will certainly witness serious consideration, in several jurisdictions, of phasing-out existing programs. At least three visited state institutions - - excluding the one which has since phased-out - - indicated the prospect that increases in female commitments might occasion reversion to single-sex status. An occasionally-expressed Federal plan which would similarly end coed programs at two FCI's and permit their use by single-sex populations, will be implemented, in the face of continuing population pressures and a lack of firm committment to the co-correctional concept, by the beginning of 1978. These alternative-utilization plans exist against a background of expectations regarding the future of equal rights legislation, and needs for additional space for female offenders.

V. CO-CORRECTIONAL MODELS

A. Induction of Models

It was observed early in the project, based on limited information, that different correctional philosophies engendered different sets of assumptions about the functions potentially to be served by co-corrections, and the processes by which desired outcomes are to be achieved. While these different sets of assumptions represented implicit theoretical models of co-corrections, one purpose for observation of existing coed institutions was to determine which theoretical models of co-corrections were actually operational. It was also anticipated early in the project "that the relative goal priorities within and between institutions are in flux,"[8] and that:

> Not only are changes observed over time in regard to the dominant philosophy of corrections, but at any given time, diverse and sometimes conflicting assumptions are found to be incorporated within a single institution or program. Co-corrections, rather than reflecting a particular well-integrated set of assumptions, is an excellent example of the diversity which may be simultaneously operative.[9]

Therefore, a second purpose of the site-visits was to observe the degree to which goal priorities had shifted, and, more importantly, how the simultaneous implementation of more than one co-correctional model affected institutional processes.

After emerging from the field, it was first apparent that inadequate attention had earlier been given to non-programmatic models of co-corrections. Before entering the field, a distinction was made between circumstances in which the integration of the sexes and the nature of the heterosexual interaction are themselves perceived as performing a positive function in terms of inmate needs and institutional control; and those in which the presence of males and females in the same institution serves other ends. However, co-corrections was earlier presented primarily within the context of programmatic functions, although some of the outcomes desired and expected to accrue from integration may be non-programmatic.

Non-programmatic functions of co-corrections reflect efforts to fulfill system needs by simultaneous placement of males and females in the same institution. The particular decision to enter co-corrections may stem from over-crowding or under-utilization of space; the need, resulting from a particular incident, for alternative placements for a number of inmates of one sex; efforts to reduce program duplication or capitalize on limited program availability; and other factors. In such situations, the non-programmatic objectives of co-corrections may be perceived as served when the placement of male and female inmates has the least effect possible on normal institutional operations.

The need to analyze the non-programmatic aspects of co-corrections emerged from site-visits, and within this functional use of co-corrections two non-programmatic models of co-corrections were distinguished. With the addition of these models to the programmatic ones which had been induced from site-visit interviews and observations, five internally-consistent logic models of co-corrections were developed. The several models evidence not only divergent motives and expectations for apparently similar objectives, but also clearly different notions regarding the processes through which often dissimilar outcomes can be reached. To a substantial degree these models reflect the application of major approaches in correctional practice to the specific area of co-corrections.

In this chapter each of these causal or logic models are outlined. It is stressed that each represents an actual operational model of co-corrections derived from activities observed in the field and discussions with those having the responsibility for implementing programs. Each is an empirical, inductive model; however, in no institution was any model more than partially articulated, and in any given institution more than one model was operative. The underlying assumptions behind the models and their linkages to operating activities are an expression of the conceptions of co-corrections held by practitioners in existing coed institutions. After a discussion of the programmatic and non-programmatic models, the effects of the simultaneous presence of several models in a single institution are considered.

B. Programmatic Co-corrections

It became clear during site-visits that co-corrections was seen as performing a positive function in the context of three general models of correctional practice operative within the institutions:

- Reintegration into the community;
- Institutional control;
- Therapy and treatment.

1. Reintegration model. The use of co-corrections in a reintegration model of corrections reflects efforts to use the male-female interaction to "normalize" the institutional environment - - to represent the fuller range of options normally available "in the free" - - and, by being less "destructive" than traditional single-sex incarceration, to ease the transition to, and reintegration into, the community after release. The function of co-corrections within the reintegration model - - which has as its overall objectives the "normalizing" of the prison environment as far as possible to lessen the "destructiveness" of the prison experience and facilitate the re-entrance of the inmate into society - - is seen as either maintaining or restoring in prison the option of interaction with the opposite sex and, thereby, effecting personal growth or preventing deterioration and "backsliding." Co-corrections here occurs in a context which stresses other "normalizing" aspects of institutional life, such as use of regular currency, inmate control over "rising-time," etc., and is generally bolstered by a focus on community programming. The positive function of co-corrections in the reintegration model is based on several underlying assumptions which were articulated by persons directly involved in the planning and administration of institutions where the model represented an "operational philosophy."

- The corrosive effects of traditional single-sex confinement impede post-release adjustment and engender continued criminality.
- The deprivation of the full range of "normal" affectional relationships, which is associated with traditional single-sex incarceration, is the source of much institutional violence and predatory homosexuality.
- "Masculine" dominance roles, and the violence associated with quarrels, triangles, etc., are undesirable in a prison setting.
- Sexual relationships occur in prison, and preferably should be voluntary and heterosexual, rather than coercive and situationally homosexual.

A brief overview of the policies and practices related to the use of co-corrections in the reintegration model will provide the basis for understanding the chain of assumptions it represents. The inputs to the reintegration model include an integrated staff and ideally, an inmate population the composition of which reflects the range of attributes found in the "outside" world, particularly in terms of sex ratio. Control adequate to minimize predatory behavior is exercised, and, where possible, inmates with histories of assault are selected out, and those displaying assaultive behavior within the institution transferred. At the same time, birth control is made available to limit pregnancies. The structured and unstructured interaction of male and female inmates is sometimes complemented, especially where the population is composed predominantly of one sex, by increasing the representation of the minority sex, through disproportionate staff integration, furloughs, use of volunteers of both sexes, and community programs. Male-female interaction is seen as engendering a relational atmosphere where the continuity or resumption of heterosexual options leads to low levels of violence, and limited use of psychotropic medication. By transferring-in incarcerated spouses, the heterosexual options of married inmates unwilling to interact with persons of the opposite sex are restored; at the same time, to increase the likelihood of post-release marital stability, the program participation of "serious" couples is restricted, if "outside" relationships are imperiled. The development of a normalized atmosphere and heterosexual options are seen as leading, in turn, to a number of interacting phenomena: maintained or increased self-worth, improved appearance and grooming, improved staff and inmate morale, and increased post-prison expectations.

The reintegration model of co-corrections anticipates the following outcomes: as a result of the presence of a more normal institutional environment, pressures for situational homosexual activity are minimized for first offenders; the resumption of heterosexual options for transfers from single-sex institutions provides a period for the redevelopment of heterosexual relational skills before release; some support is present for the continuation of marital bonds between incarcerated couples; and finally, the sexual options of protection cases, transferred-in because of the haven afforded by low levels of institutional violence, are protected. These outcomes provided by co-corrections contribute to reduced post-release adjustment problems, which in turn reduce recidivism.

2. Institutional control model. The use of co-corrections in an institutional control model reflects the perceived value of the male-female interaction in normalizing the institutional environment, as in the reintegration model. The focus of the co-corrections institutional control model is on the power of the male-female interaction as a management tool in the reduction of institutional violence. The model is often found together with the reintegration model, because they both use the male-female interaction in shaping the institutional environment, despite the fact that many other input, process, and outcome elements differ between the two models. The institutional control model of co-corrections is based on the following underlying assumptions which were most clearly articulated by those staff members in co-correctional institutions who were more directly responsible for institutional control.

- The deprivation of the full range of "normal" interactions with the opposite sex, which is associated with traditional single-sex incarceration, is a principal source of institutional violence, predatory homosexuality, and other problem behaviors.
- "Masculine" dominance roles, and the violence associated with quarrels, triangles, etc., are undesirable in a prison setting.
- Sexual relationships, if they occur in prison, should preferably be voluntary and heterosexual, rather than coercive and situationally homosexual.
- The presence of the opposite sex in an institutional setting provides a diversion which lessens institutional violence, predatory homosexuality, and other problem behaviors.

A brief overview will suggest both the differences and similarities between the use of co-corrections in institutional control and reintegration models, and provide a framework for understanding the chain of assumptions it represents. The inputs to the institutional control model include an integrated staff, and an integrated inmate population, as heterogeneous as possible, and containing a sufficiently visible representation of the minority sex to develop and maintain a "normalized" atmosphere, but not close enough to sexual parity to risk precipitating a battle of the sexes to "structure the situation." Control adequate to minimize predatory behavior is exercised, and population control effected through selecting out those with assaultive histories, transfer of those displaying assaultive behavior within the institution, and selective transfer for heterosexual intercourse, or for pregnancies which occur within the institution. The structured and unstructured interaction of male and female inmates is sometimes complemented by increased representation of the minority sex, through disproportionate line-staff integration, furloughs, use of volunteers of both sexes, and community programs. Male-female interaction leads to a less tense and crisis-oriented atmosphere, and to a continuity or resumption of heterosexual options, which are reinforced by furloughs and community programs. The continuity or resumption of heterosexual options, improved appearance and grooming, and maintained or increased self-worth occur in interaction with each other, and sustain a high level of inmate morale. Staff and inmate morale increase as a function of male-female interaction, staff in-service training, which explores and clarifies expected staff-inmate relationships, and the maintenance or increase of a sense of self-worth. At the same time, program participation by "serious" couples is restricted, in order to achieve low emotional involvement between inmates, but with the inadvertent effect of threatening increased staff and inmate morale. Transfer for heterosexual intercourse, inside pregnancy, and assaultive behavior, reinforces a low level of emotional involvement; and, should heterosexual options bring about a high level of "coupling," coed programming may be cut back, to decrease the probability of emotional involvement. Low emotional involvement, availability of birth control, and selective use of transfer combine to limit pregnancy rates, although furloughs and community programs may increase the level of non-institutional pregnancy. Low emotional involvement, a non-institutionalized atmosphere, and the availability of heterosexual options, yield a safe and manageable environment, relatively free of sexual and sex-related violence.

3. Therapy model. The function of co-corrections in a therapy model also involves use of the male-female interaction to "normalize" the institutional atmosphere, but with an eye less on the provision of the fuller range of options normally obtainable "outside," and more on the deliberate development of circumstances which allow "working with," and the correction of, "sexually abnormal" attitudes and behaviors. The focus of the co-correctional therapy model is on the effects of the male-female interaction upon the development of an atmosphere which limits the necessity and frequency of exploitive behavior, and on the reduction of evident or presumed "sexual abnormalities," which are in turn presumed to be a direct or indirect cause of criminal behavior. The model is often found together with the reintegration model, even though they differ in selection criteria, means of population control, levels of control, function of program restrictions, and in primary intended outcomes. The therapy model of co-corrections is based on the following underlying assumptions which were outlined most frequently by administrators and treatment personnel in institutions with a history of providing a "therapeutic milieu."

- Much criminal behavior stems, directly or indirectly, from the absence of healthy relationships with the opposite sex, or the inability to explore problems of sexual identification.
- Traditional single-sex incarceration has exacerbated the sexual abnormality of offenders by fostering development of homosexual and often violent subcultures.
- As undesirable as "masculine" dominance roles are in a prison setting, they must sometimes be tolerated if certain role changes are to be effected.
- Sexual relationships occur in prison and preferably should be voluntary, non-exploitive, and heterosexual, or at least voluntary and non-exploitive, rather than coercive and situationally homosexual.
- To achieve correction of sexually abnormal behaviors and attitudes, some "acting-out" behavior must be tolerated, and control policies must be constructed and implemented with discretion and sensitivity.

- Those inmates who have traditionally been the focus of sexual exploitation require a higher level of protection of sexual options than others.

A brief overview will suggest the complexities of using co-corrections in a therapy model. The inputs to the therapy model include an at least partially integrated staff, and an integrated inmate population, as heterogeneous as possible, and containing a sufficiently visible number of the minority sex to provide a "therapeutic tool" for both sexes. The "sexually abnormal" -- potentially to include prostitutes, sex offenders, and drug abusers whose criminality is presumed to derive from problems of sex-identity -- are intentionally over-selected and a differential control policy offers extra protection to males and females with histories of being sexually exploited, while allowing levels of "acting out" behavior sufficient to permit the therapeutic process to operate. The differential control policy and the policy of tolerating "acting-out" behavior require the implementation of staff in-service training. The resultant clarification of policy and increased understanding of the basis for policy lead to increased staff and inmate morale. The structured and unstructured interaction of male and female inmates brings about a more supportive atmosphere, which in turn facilitates the role of the structured and unstructured interaction of males and females, including a range of therapy modalities, in bringing about non-exploitive heterosexual relationships, a clarification of sex-identity, and the perception of the opposite sex as "peers" and "co-workers." The restriction of program participation together by "serious" couples ordinarily occurs only when relationships are perceived as exploitive. The development of non-exploitive heterosexual relationships leads to development of heterosexual coping skills; the clarification of sex-identity to increased self-acceptance; and the perception of the opposite sex as "peers" and "co-workers" to the reduction of sex-role stereotypes. The more supportive atmosphere increases self-worth, which combines with the development of heterosexual coping skills to effect changes in appearance and roles; at the same time, dress codes may mandate changes in appearance, and interact with other variables to effect role changes. Changes in appearance and roles may inadvertently combine with the toleration of "acting-out" behavior to increase "therapeutic" pregnancies, i.e., those which may further contribute to a shift in sex-identity. Changes in appearance and roles, development of heterosexual coping skills, increased self-acceptance, and reduced sex-role stereotypes, combine to reduce post-release adjustment problems, and reduce recidivism.

C. Non-programmatic Co-corrections

While co-correctional relationships may be seen as integral components of correctional models involving reintegration, institutional control and therapy, when co-corrections has been introduced into an institution where it was not viewed as a dimension of the institutional program but rather as a management problem, two approaches have been observed. Both focus on the presence of male-female interaction and attempt to minimize its effects on institutional life, but they vary in their approach to its control. When the major means for the control and limitation of interaction is through a combination of restrictions on contact, high levels of supervision or surveillance, and strict and severe disciplinary action, the management approach has been designated as a surveillance and sanction model. When the effort to minimize male-female inmate interaction occurs through the development of alternate relations by maximizing staff, local community or family contacts, as well as work, educational and recreational activity which provides for alternate uses of time and attention, the term alternate choice has been chosen for the model.

1. Surveillance and sanction model. The co-corrections surveillance and sanction model emerges when system needs, especially economies in the use of staff and space, are perceived to shift an existing or planned single-sex institution into co-corrections. The focus of the surveillance and sanction model is on minimizing the effect of the presence of both sexes on operations, and on allowing the system to fulfill its needs. The institutional control and surveillance and sanction models share intended outcomes: low rates of pregnancy, sexual and sex-related assault, and emotional involvement. However, the methods of population control in the surveillance and sanction model are more stringent than in any of the programmatic models. Institutional energies are marshalled in the surveillance and sanction model toward achievement of these outcomes, on the expectation that, if problem behaviors related to pregnancy, assault, and emotional involvement can be minimized, the institution will have effectively functioned as a "depository," and system needs will have been served. This management model of co-corrections is based on the following underlying assumptions articulated most frequently by administrators of institutions where decisions regarding the implementation of co-corrections were made substantially at the system level.

- The presence of both male and female inmates in the same institution poses a management problem which must be tolerated in the interest of system-level goals.
- Standard prison operations should not be altered by the presence of the opposite sex.
- Sexual relations will occur in prison unless a high level of external controls is present.
- Because of the higher probability that staff will condone heterosexual relationships, staff sanctions must be as high as inmate sanctions, if "operations as normal" are to be maintained.
- Priority implementation of external controls will allow maintenance of normal operations.

A brief overview of the elements of this model will provide the basis for the chain of assumptions it represents. The trigger for the surveillance and sanction model is the existence of one or more system needs, and the expected impact of housing male and female prisoners under the same roof. In order to minimize problem behaviors, and maintain normal operations, and in the absence of any perceived benefit to be derived from allowing full contact between inmates, a limited contact policy is formulated. On the assumption that external controls are required, the decision to permit limited contact leads to control through high surveillance and heavy sanctions. High surveillance may take several forms: facility modification, increases in supervisory staff either out of complement or from additional positions, or movement restrictions. Heavy sanctions are reflected primarily in population control through transfer for contact violations, although sanctions against staff are also heavy, especially when staff are perceived to put inmates in "embarassing positions" by failing to maintain low inmate-inmate, or staff-inmate, emotional involvement. Through the priority implementation of control policy, it is expected that low rates of pregnancy, sexual and sex-related assault, and emotional involvement will result, and that thereby system needs will be served.

The achievement of system needs, however, may be counterindicated by the occurrence of certain unintended effects of adopting a surveillance and sanction model of co-corrections. Implementation of movement restrictions may lead to dual programs for each sex, and intensify the perceived need for increased supervisory staff. If increases in supervisory staff are taken out of the existing staff, programs may have to be further modified. Program modifications and heavy inmate sanctions may decrease inmate morale, and lead to disturbances. The increase of supervisory staff, heavy staff sanctions, and the presence or threat of disturbances, may decrease staff morale. Decreased staff morale may lead to a high rate of staff turnover. Several factors may lead to increased per capita costs: facility modification, new supervisory staff positions, dual programs, and high staff turnover. Increased per capita costs may be counter to the fulfillment of system level needs; moreover, transferring inmates who violate contact regulations, and thereby becoming more "selective" an institution, may also be counter to fulfilling system level needs for flexible population placement.

2. Alternate choice model. The co-correctional alternate choice model, like the surveillance and sanction model, emerges when an institution is perceived to be "dumped" into co-corrections in the interest of system-level needs. The model arises less as a conscious management strategy to control problem behavior, and more as an alternate route for reaching system goals which inmates and line-staff urge highly-controlled institutions to adopt. It reflects the assumption that full contact is manageable, given sufficient options, without high surveillance and heavy sanctions. This model generally arises within the context of, and in reaction to, the surveillance and sanction model, and contends that the goals of the surveillance and sanction model can be reached without sustaining the associated costs. This model of co-corrections is based on the following underlying assumptions which were expressed most consistently by lower line and staff personnel, and from another perspective, by inmates.

- The presence of both male and female inmates in the same institution poses a management problem which must be tolerated in the interest of system-level goals.
- Standard prison operations need not be altered by the presence of the opposite sex.
- Sexual relations are normal and inevitable, but a prison requires a minimum of external controls to limit their occurrence.
- Sexual relations between inmates are more appropriately limited by providing alternate means to "keep busy," and the opportunity for alternate relationships, which support personal internal controls.

A brief overview of the elements of the alternate choice model will provide the basis for the chain of assumptions it represents. The trigger for the alternate choice model is the same as that for the surveillance and sanction model: the expectation within the system that system-level needs can be served by housing male and female inmates in a designated institution. In order to minimize problem behavior, and maintain normal operations, and in the face of perceived or anticipated counter-productive effects of directing institutional resources toward surveillance and sanctions, a non-restrictive contact policy is adopted. On the assumption that sufficient options will allow the institution to accomplish its intended outcomes, the decision to permit inmate contact leads to the implementation of alternate means of control, which are presented by, or to, inmates as "alternate choices." These alternate choices include: alternate relationships, alternate uses of time, alternate income sources, selective surveillance and sanctions for coercive relationships, and birth control. Alternate relationships (furloughs and visitation, community programs, and staff-inmate relationships) and alternate uses of time (educational options, full work assignments, and broad recreational options) are expected to yield low emotional involvement between inmates. Alternate uses of time, alternate income sources (industrial and educational pay), birth control, and low emotional involvement are expected to result in low pregnancy rates. Selective surveillance and sanctions (for assault, and with uniform sanctions for both males and females, and both homosexual and heterosexual relations), alternate income sources, and low emotional involvement are expected to bring about low frequencies of sexual or sex-related assault. Implementation of staff in-service training to work through and clarify co-correctional policies is expected to increase staff morale, fostered by the encouragement of staff-inmate relationships as one more "alternate relationship." The levels of emotional involvement between inmates, pregnancy, and sexual or sex-related assault, are expected to be as low as, or lower than, those produced through exclusive use of surveillance and sanctions. By obtaining its intended outcomes, the alternate choice model is expected to serve system needs. The costs associated with the delivery of alternate uses of time (educational options, full work assignments, and recreational options) and alternate income sources (industrial and educational pay) are expected to be lower than the fiscal and human costs associated with the surveillance and sanction model of co-corrections. Moreover, the delivery of a relatively high level of programs to keep inmates "busy" and prevent "just sittin' around and thinkin' about sex," may secondarily result in the development of community contacts, employable skills, a bank account, and other tangible and intangible assets, which may, after release, lead to reduced criminal activity.

D. Programmatic and Non-programmatic Co-corrections

The above presentation and discussion of programmatic and non-programmatic models of co-corrections suggested some of the points at which given models are either compatible, or in conflict. Each of these models was present and operative, in varying degrees, in each existing co-correctional institution. Although a single model often predominated, no one model was unanimously espoused, and no model was fully articulated. Under ordinary conditions, the several models generally "coexisted" with each other and "everything flowed," despite the "state of tension" prevailing among the divergent processes and objectives represented in the models.

Day-to-day operations were often perceived differently as a function of different conceptions of co-corrections. The day-to-day operations of a given institution might very well be interpreted within selected models by different sectors of an institution: for example, within an institutional control framework by the central office, the alternate choice model by the line-staff, on the premises of normalization and reintegration by the administration, and in terms of therapy by the treatment staff. However, while the division of labor might have influenced what functions co-corrections was presumed to serve, it was also evident that within each level of an institution, and each person taking part in an institution's life, a measure of ambivalence existed about the model, or models, within which the institution was addressing operational issues, and formulating expectations. From this ambiguity emerged divergent policies, wide ranges in the level of policy implementation, inconsistent modes of action, and heated debates about both actual and ideal policies, programs and objectives. This ambiguity was reflected in such basic questions as: Do we actually house a highly selected inmate population, or a typical one? Are we selecting-out inmates with certain characteristics, and how uniformly? How long do we, and should we, "work with" someone who finds it difficult to abide by "the rule" of co-corrections? Do we, and should we, tolerate "acting-out" behavior? Are we concerned more with the special requirements of a population in need of rehabilitation, the reduction of destructive aspects of incarceration, or neither of these?

Such interplay among divergent policies and expectations was observed to "wreak havoc" with institutional life in an imperceptible, insidious way, "like arsenic." Occasionally the presence of divergent models was reported to surface dramatically, making it clear that even identical words -- words such as "normalization" -- held several different theoretical and operational meanings within the same institutional community. In other words, there were generally not one, but several programs related to co-corrections in the same institution. The following chapter considers the elements that need to be measured in any evaluation of co-corrections, given the diversity of models in the field.

VI. SYNTHESIZED MEASUREMENT MODEL

Because the implementation of co-corrections, regardless of its assumed programmatic or non-programmatic functions, requires basic decisions at the system and institutional levels, it appeared to be possible and appropriate to develop a synthesized measurement model outlining the potential system impacts, inputs, processes, outcomes, and co-correctional impacts on the system, which should be considered in any evaluation of co-corrections. One of the functions of the resultant measurement model is to indicate the apparent causal chains involved in the functioning of co-correctional institutions, and to trace the effects of change in any given variable on the other variables represented in the model. In the Frameworks Paper, to which the interested reader is referred, key variables involved in the implementation of a decision to "go coed" at both the system and institutional levels, were tied to possible measures for each of the variables.

The particular set of desired, or expected, outcomes will determine which measurement points will be most critical in a particular evaluation, and the type and range of acceptable measures. However, before "real evaluation" can occur, some basis for comparison must be provided, either with single-sex institutions, other co-correctional institutions, or the coed institution under study in a before-after design. Moreover, it should be stressed that in all appropriate key measurement points, data should be systematically collected with the comparative question of the differential effect of co-corrections upon men and women in mind; if distinctions are not made analytically between the sexes, this critical issue will remain unaddressed, and the "outcomes" of co-corrections cannot be adequately evaluated.

A. System Inputs

There are a series of correctional system-level conditions which constitute major system inputs in the consideration of the introduction, continuation, modification, and/or withdrawal from co-corrections. Nine major system conditions emerged from the materials gathered in site-visits and administrative descriptions of other co-correctional facility development. In any given correctional jurisdiction, one or more of these conditions may be operable in the inception and administration of a co-correctional facility, and their interaction may partially determine the input, processes and outputs of any given or anticipated co-correctional program. The major system inputs are as follows:

- The anticipated or actual level of inmate populations, in relation to existing distributions of population and total system capacity, is such that each institution in the jurisdiction is re-examined in view of potential alternate populations, by age, sex, and security level.
- Existing single-sex institutions are not being used at their capacity, and space is available for inmates of the opposite sex.
- A high proportion of inmates of one sex at a particular security level may be accommodated at an underutilized opposite-sex institution which includes the same security level.

- The duplication of programs and services in a single-sex institution involves high per capita costs.

- The use of labor of the opposite sex to provide services in a single-sex institution is anticipated to reduce costs.

- Certain programs absent in single-sex institutions are available in institutions of the opposite sex, or the potential development of new programs is expected to become more feasible with a larger population.

- A facility for youthful offenders is absent or inadequate.

- A facility for a given sex in certain regions of the correctional system's jurisdiction is absent or inadequate.

- For reasons of normalization, institutional control, and/or treatment outcomes, a decision is reached that co-corrections is a desired correctional program.

The basis for the decision - - upon the above system needs - - to implement a co-correctional program will determine, at least initially, the desired outcomes and the rationale for a given strategy. However, it is possible that the presence of several desired outcomes, with significantly different associated strategies, may limit the probable effectiveness with which any strategy is implemented and any one of the intended outcomes obtained. For example, population pressures within the correctional system and the availability of housing within a single-sex institution may be a major reason for the decision to develop co-corrections. At the same time, the introduction of the opposite sex into an institution with a particular program structure may provide a wider range of choice for the inmates involved. As a result, the availability and utilization of programs may become a desired outcome of the co-correctional effort. However, if system-level population pressures result in population increases in the co-correctional institution which cause significant changes in staff-inmate ratios, over-crowding, and increased institutional tension, then further decisions may be made, for reasons of control, to restrict access to programs. Or, even if a system decision involves a desire for normalization, the inmate sex-ratios which may be considered necessary for its implementation may be difficult to maintain, if the system's population pressures are significantly higher for either male or female inmates.

Regardless of the particular system needs, and the consequent desired outcomes, these system needs will be implemented within a particular institutional setting, and will involve other critical variables. Some of these variables are the function of the general population characteristics of a jurisdiction; others are specific to a given institution, including capacity, type of facility, and staff backgrounds.

B. Institutional Inputs

Seven critical input variables, applicable within a given institutional setting, were suggested by site-visit interviews and the literature on co-corrections. Changes in these variables may result from changes in system-level characteristics, and may occur without consideration of their potential impact on the co-correctional aspects of the institution. At the same time, however, they may be modified as a result of the processes within the institution in the development of a co-correctional program. In this sense, they may operate as both independent and dependent variables. At any point in the analysis, however, they may be considered as "givens" or inputs.

- Capacity of the institution. This not only refers to the total rated capacity of the facility, but also the capacity of those buildings, lounges, libraries, floors, etc., which have been at any given time designated for the use of the male or female inmates. A particular capacity will not only affect the sex ratio, but also the extent of differential treatment (single rooms, dormitories, level of under-or over-utilization).

- Sex ratio of both inmates and staff. Sex ratios become critical in the consideration of nature and level of inmates relationships and staff-inmate interaction, staff distribution and utilization, and in the development and utilization of programs.

- Racial (and ethnic) ratios within and between the sexes. The effect of these ratios may be a function of both staff and inmate attitudes regarding the desirability of inter-racial heterosexual relationships, and the availability of a proportionate number of each racial or ethnic group of the opposite sex.

- Size of staff and inmate population. The actual size of both the staff and the inmate population directly affects staff-inmate ratios, and may affect the availability and utilization of programs, the range of potential inter-relationships, per capita costs, and the levels and types of control to be developed, given their association with particular staff-inmate ratios.

- Security levels. This variable not only includes the given security levels of the institution, which will affect access to furlough and community programming, and other programs, but also the possible presence of different ranges in security levels for male and female inmates within the institution. The conversion of the only women's institution within a correctional jurisdiction to co-corrections may result in the presence of differing security levels for women and men. Consequently, the level of restrictions may change, and the nature of given security levels may be redefined.

- Age range. The range of ages within the total population, as well as the range within the population of a given sex, may affect, not only the nature of the relationships between the sexes within the institution, but also the proportion of inmates with marital and/or family relationships outside the institution.

- Program types. The number and types of programs available in a given institution ranges partially as a function of the above listed variables. Program availability may affect inmate relationships in terms of time use, and income source, as well as in other more manifest functions. In addition, the absence of certain programs within the institution for either both sexes, or one sex, and their availability in single-sex institutions within the jurisdiction, may also affect the effectiveness of sanction by transfer.

Within the context of these seven variables, and the system needs which determine the initial desired outcomes, the processes involved in the development and maintenance of a co-correctional institution occur.

C. Institutional Processes

For purposes of presentation, the major co-correctional processes within the institution were divided into three major areas, designated as inmate, staff and program flows. In reality, however, the critical process flow may involve the levels and nature of the inmate interactions, which in turn are affected by, and affect, program and staff. The desired outcomes will partially determine the planned level and nature of the interaction. However, the complexity and tenuous predictability of the interrelated processes present both within the institutional setting, and in outside systems impacting on the institution, may play a more critical role in the interaction patterns than any administrative decision. In any case, the major focus in co-corrections is precisely on the coed relationship, regardless of the functions, or lack of functions, this relationship is perceived to play. The following discussion of institutional processes is divided into five sections: contact policy, control mechanisms, implementation of policy, inmate interaction, and program structure.

1. Contact policy. While the actual inmate interactions will be a function of the individual decisions of particular inmates, based on their attitudes regarding self-identification, sex-role attributes, appropriate sexual behavior, and other factors, from an administrative viewpoint these decisions will take place within the context of a specific policy in regard to physical contact and designated times and places for social interaction. The content of that policy, as already noted, will partially reflect the system outcomes desired - - for example, therapy or facility utilization - - but will also reflect three exogenous variables, as well as one critical internal input variable. Based on administrative interviews, it appears that decisions in regard to policy on both physical contact and amounts of male-female interaction are affected by these exogenous factors: perceptions of what the "local community" views as "allowable behavior" within a co-correctional institution; verbal or written comments, or court actions, by other criminal justice agencies, either within the same jurisdiction, or by colleagues from other correctional jurisdictions; and both state statutes and correctional system general policy guidelines on sexual relations. Moreover, the perceived attitudes of the staff appear to play a key role in the determination of policy, since the implementation of that policy, generally requires the support of at least a majority of the staff, particularly the correctional staff.

The actual policy in regard to physical contact may range from complete restriction of contact to prohibition of only intercourse, or of only sexual assault.

Whether the restrictions placed on contact with the opposite sex apply equally to homosexual contact, and, if not, whether a rationale is provided for any divergence in the two standards, is an important consideration. The policy in regard to interaction levels generally distinguishes between contact during programs - - for example, work, education, organizations, structured recreation, and dining periods - - and contact during unscheduled periods, with specific times and places designated for social interaction. The level of the restrictions will generally affect the degree of control which is necessary in order to enforce policy: a policy of no physical contact may require a greater use of control mechanisms for its enforcement than one which only restricts physical assault, but does not attempt to regulate other aspects of the relationship between the sexes.

2. Control mechanisms. The use of particular control mechanisms almost immediately affects the wider institutional program, and may have direct effects on other system outcomes, such as per capita costs, or program utilization. Two major types of control mechanisms may be distinguished: surveillance and sanctions. Among the surveillance controls are those which are facility related, such as lighting, fences, communications equipment, and dual facilities; those which focus on control of movement, either by the general use of passes, or by restricting to certain times and places the movement of one or both sexes; and those which involve direct staff supervision. In the last case, the supervision may be achieved by increasing security staff, by either hiring new officers, reallocation of positions, or the extension of supervisory responsibilities to non-security personnel. The use of any of these control mechanisms may affect, among other variables, the nature and level of the inmate interaction, program development, program utilization, inmate and staff morale, and per capita costs. The use of sanctions also represents a major control factor, and the presence of a high level of sanctions for contact policy violations - - including segregation, time loss, transfer, or the pressing of criminal charges - - will similarly affect wider institutional functions. Use of such control mechanisms will not only affect inmate interaction levels, but also, among other variables, inmate and staff morale, staff-inmate relationships, and an institution's relationship with other institutions and criminal justice agencies.

3. Implementation of policy. Important to a discussion of levels of contact allowed, restrictions on relationships, and the intensity of control mechanisms, is the degree to which policy is actually implemented. Implementation is indicated partly by a causal chain in the flow chart involving staff. The key aspects of staff in relation to co-corrections consists of staff attitudes, and the presence or introduction of a sexually integrated staff. Staff attitudes are significant in regard to heterosexual and homosexual behavior, inter-racial relationships, the sex-role attributes of men and women in general, and perceptions of the characteristics of both male and female correctional personnel, and male and female inmates or "criminals." To the degree that significant attitudinal differences prevail among the staff, particularly either among staff serving in different correctional positions, or between the sexes or racial groups, there will be considerable ambivalence about implementing or enforcing any given policy on contact. The presence of an in-service program may partially alleviate the divergent attitudes, but a high level of implementation may only be achieved by the use of staff sanctions. The use of staff sanctions may, in turn, lead to lowered staff morale, and a possible high level of turnover.

4. Inmate interaction. The actual level of interaction is a function of not only policy implementation, but also, as noted above, of the presence of particular attitudes among the inmate body. For example, if the inmate body contains an active group of homosexuals, for whom homosexuality represents a component of self-identity, rather than a situational adaptation, then the development of a heterosexual milieu will probably not affect their homosexual activity. However, a heterosexual milieu will provide an option for those inmates who may have been involved only in situational homosexuality, those who have no previous prison experience, and those who avoided close relationships in single-sex institutions. The degree to which there may be more basic changes in sex-roles and self-identity may be a function of the levels of control, and the nature of the relationships explored and developed within the program structure of the institution.

5. Program structure. The co-correctional decision may be associated with certain effects on the programs of an institution. Certain aspects of a program are directly related to co-corrections, such as the presence of integration in a program, and the level of participation of each sex in a program. The level of participation may not only be affected by direct policy decisions, but also by the degree to which the sex ratio affects the level of participation. A sharp minority position in certain areas may lead to an actual lack of integration which may not be a function of policy, but a question of the domination of an activity by one sex. Another aspect of program development is the degree to which program participation provides an alternate use of the time which might otherwise be focussed on "coeding", or supplies a source of the income which might otherwise be provided by commerce in heterosexual (or homosexual) relationships.

In addition, the presence of both staff and community members as co-participants or volunteers in programs provides alternatives to the relationships available within the inmate body. The presence of furlough and work- and study-release programs, in particular, may significantly affect the nature and extent of inmate relationships. This is particularly true when furloughs provide for a continuation of marital and familial bonds.

One area that may be particularly affected by co-corrections is medical service. It is not clear whether co-corrections itself, or the addition to a men's institution of women whose use of medical facilities is perceived as greater, is the key variable in medical use. However, implementation of policies regarding the provisions of birth control materials, the availability of abortion, and provision for pre-natal care directly affects hospital services. These policies may be externally influenced by jurisdictional guidelines, or perceived local community attitudes. The presence or absence of heavy sanctions for intercourse may affect the level of non-medical abortions, while a lower level of either sanctions or implementation may lessen the number of abortions and increase the need of the institution for child placement policies and services.

The development of new programs -- for example, in psychological services, in response to issues raised in a co-correctional program, or in the educational or work areas, as a result of either the introduction of the opposite sex, or a greater inmate population available for the programs -- may lead to additional staff positions or program costs, which will affect the per capita institutional costs.

As noted earlier, there may be feedback effects within the actual institutional processes. In using the measurement model, it is important to determine whether, for any given program, a particular point represents a dependent or independent variable, or whether it may be considered as an intervening or antecedent variable in relation to any given outcome. Such distinctions are critical in noting the "outcome" involved in a particular causal flow, since often outcomes were not the intended results of a given system "input" or need.

D. Institutional Outcomes

Outcomes should be related to the original system needs since, in doing so, a basic measurement point for evaluation is identified. For example, cost reduction may be the system need which originally precipitated the introduction of co-corrections. The difference between the anticipated and actual cost reduction can provide a measurement of the "effectiveness" of co-corrections. However, in reality, the other possible "costs" -- such as staff turnover, changes in the institutional milieu, and limited program participation -- would also need to be "calculated" in determining the costs involved in the introduction of co-corrections. The following represent key institutional outcomes: facility use in relation to capacity, levels of inmate emotional involvement, changes in appearance, provision of sexual options, changes in assault levels, inmate transfer levels, staff turnover, institutional milieu, pregnancy level, program utilization, and per capita costs. The key institutional outcomes above need to be considered in relation to each other, as well as in terms of desired outcomes.

E. System Outcomes

Consideration of system outcomes arises from the distinction between co-correctional facilities which were constituted substantially for programmatic reasons, and those which occured almost exclusively due to system needs unrelated to the coed relationship. Certain outcomes are closely related to potential post-release adjustment, which is generally associated with a programmatic intent; others are more clearly related to system needs. The outcomes which may be viewed as related to post-release adjustment are: emotional involvement, appearance, sexual options, assault levels, transfers, institutional milieu, and pregnancies. When outcomes positively impact on post-release adjustment, it is then expected that recidivism levels will be reduced, as a final impact on the criminal justice system.

A different combination of outcomes can be considered as measurements of the effectiveness of using co-corrections as the solution of other correctional system needs. The effectiveness of co-corrections in these areas may lead, but only indirectly and secondarily, to more positive post-release adjustment and reduced recidivism, perhaps through the reduction of population pressure in certain institutions, or the channeling of resources into programming. The outcomes related to system needs are: facility use to capacity, assault level change, transfers, staff turnover, pregnancies, program utilization, and per capita costs. The measurement of the effectiveness of co-corrections for the system is directly related to the particular system needs expected to be served by the introduction of co-corrections. However, as noted before, these must be considered in relation to other perhaps unanticipated outcomes which may also affect system functioning.

The following three chapters discuss: available evaluation data within the context of the synthesized measurement model; general considerations in planning research on co-corrections; and designs or research strategies for extending the state-of-knowledge about co-corrections.

VII. AVAILABLE EVALUATION DATA

A. Existing Research Designs

Most research on co-corrections has focused on the first Federal and State coed institutions -- Fort Worth and Framingham -- though Lexington and Pleasanton have also recently been increasingly the object of study. The preponderance of research on co-corrections has been exclusively or substantially descriptive, and has generally viewed co-corrections as one variable in the institutional environment, including efforts by CONSAD,[10] Heffernan and Krippel,[11] Lambiotte,[12] Patrick,[13] Patrick and McCurdy,[14] Smykla,[15] and the initial phase of a continuing Framingham study, by Almy et al.[16]

Review of the readily available research materials on co-correctional institutions establishes that evaluation studies in the topic area are limited. Several research designs exist, including those of Cavior,[17] Flynn,[18] Heffernan,[19] Jackson,[20] Carney,[21] and a coordinated Federal effort by Burkhead, Cavior and Mabli.[22] These designs either remain at the proposal stage, were partially implemented, or are currently being implemented. An early design by Cavior was not implemented, in the absence of adequate momentum in the Bureau of Prisons to justify a major effort, but contributed substantially to two later studies now in progress, one by Cavior, and the second by Burkhead, Cavior and Mabli. Designs by both Heffernan and Jackson, focusing on the Fort Worth FCI, were only partially implemented, due to difficulty in obtaining either an adequate data base within the institution and/or compatible comparative data from other single-sex and coed institutions. An extensive study of Framingham was earlier projected by Flynn, but administrative changes within the institution hindered its implementation. A series of Framingham recidivism studies performed under Carney's direction have issued from the Massachusetts Department of Corrections and the Boston University School of Social Work, and will presumably be continued. The commonest measurements used in implemented co-correctional research designs include program participation rates, disciplinary levels, recidivism rates, and measures of institutional atmosphere. However, the investigation in progress by Burkhead, Cavior and Mabli uses a wider range of measurements, provides for compatible comparative data, and constitutes the first large-scale, systematic research on co-corrections. The result of both partially implemented and completed designs will be summarized and assessed below against the measures recommended in the synthesized measurement model, and followed by a brief discussion of the major Federal study.

However, before considering the results of previous investigations in terms of measures suggested by the synthesized measurement model, a brief discussion of the most extensive study of co-corrections to date, the two year Heffernan-Krippel research project at FCI Fort Worth, is warranted. Heffernan and Krippel examined co-corrections in the context of a medium-security, open institution, housing a population heterogeneous in regard to age, race and offense type, as well as sex, and with an explicit correctional philosophy of "mutuality," and "community engagement." In addition to its descriptive purposes, this study was designed to "explore the question of the degree to which the approaches to corrections embodied in the programs at Fort Worth can be reproduced in other institutional settings." Co-corrections was conceptualized in the Heffernan-Krippel study as one component of a total program involving "normalization." The possible interrelations among these components, including co-corrections, within the Fort Worth FCI were developed in a section of the Final Report on the possible replication of these components in other institutional settings. Data was collected on differential program participation, disciplinary levels and rates between the two sexes, and some comparative data on recidivism was used. This effort, although the most extensive to date, must be regarded as "exploratory," and from the work of Heffernan and Krippel certain major hypotheses about the normalizing effects of co-corrections have been derived, and subsequently proliferated - - or at least entertained - - wherever co-corrections has "sprung up." Like Jackson's study, the main limitation of the Heffernan-Krippel report - - which represents the closest cousin to a "classic" available in the topic area of co-corrections - - is that it focuses on the Fort Worth program as a whole, and only secondarily on co-corrections.

B. Outcome Evaluation

The measurement model indicated that the key outcomes associated with co-corrections involve the following variables: facility use in relation to capacity; emotional involvement; provision of heterosexual options; appearance and roles; assault levels; inmate transfer levels; staff turnover; institutional milieu; pregnancy level; program utilization; and per capita costs. The expected/desired/tolerable ranges of values for each variable, and the relative importance of a given variable in the evaluation of a given institution or institutional type, will vary as a function of the level of programmatic intent. Site-visit interviews and a review of available research data showed that few of the measurements associated with these outcomes have been collected either to monitor institutional performance, or to evaluate program effectiveness. Institutions functioning primarily within non-programmatic models of co-corrections have a limited interest in monitoring the effects of co-corrections on institutional operations and, because they have not built in evaluation components, have yielded almost no quantitative or qualitative research on co-correctional outcomes. Certain types of data may have been tabulated but not published, such as pregnancy levels; data on assault levels and staff turnover may have been collected, but not be readily available or suitable for cross-comparisons. This circumstance may be reflective of the general state-of-the-art in correctional research, and not to data collection and research on co-corrections in particular.

Even where co-corrections has been associated with a programmatic intent, research efforts have been either descriptive and/or generally qualitative, or involved quantitative measurements without an adequate basis for comparison. As part of their design, Heffernan and Krippel hypothesized that disciplinaries for assaults and sexual activity, and administrative transfers for the same offenses, would be inversely related to "the opportunity for contact with both sexes in a variety of roles, by age, background, and occupational expectation through a diversity of population within the inmate body, staff, and outside contacts." In the absence of adequate comparative data, the effects of male-female interaction on disciplinary levels could not really be determined. The only outcome that has been quantitatively studied has been institutional milieu. Jackson's study of the effects of co-corrections on institutional milieu, or atmosphere, provides comparative data on institutional environments for male and female inmates at Fort Worth, and, on a limited basis, with women at Alderson and the Kennedy Youth Center, and men in comparable units at Seagoville. However, this study focuses on the Fort

Worth program as a whole, and only secondarily on co-corrections, and could not provide comparative data on other co-correctional institutions. Almy et al. also provided some "soft" quantitative data on the social climate at Framingham, focusing on communication and information flow, punishment and reward, inmate subcultures, sexual relationships, and relationships with the outside community. In addition, some data exists on changes in self-concepts among inmates at certain Federal institutions, but not in any form which would permit conclusions about the effects of co-corrections on self-concept. Program participation rates were a variable in the Heffernan and Krippel study, but were conceptualized not in relation to co-corrections, but as an independent variable hypothetically having an effect on disciplinary levels; although co-corrections was not part of this hypothesis, the finding that both disciplinary levels and the level of supervision for women was disproportionately high led to the hypothesis that closer surveillance, might be increasing the likelihood of detection, or even triggering inappropriate behavior. This observation engendered a decrease in surveillance, and, hence, the object of study was altered by the process of investigation. In summary, little quantitative and limited qualitative data exists which would permit an assessment of the effects of co-corrections on institutional outcomes.

C. Impact Evaluation

Both programmatic and non-programmatic models of co-corrections anticipate system impacts: programmatic models, the reduction of post-release adjustment problems and recidivism rates; non-programmatic models, the fulfillment of those system-level needs which triggered the original shift into co-corrections. The effectiveness of co-corrections as a solution to correctional system needs may lead, but only indirectly and secondarily, to more positive post-release adjustment and reduced recidivism, perhaps through reduction of population pressure in certain institutions, or the channeling of resources into programming. In any case, non-programmatic models of co-corrections do not anticipate that post-release inmate behavior will be positively impacted by the presence and interaction of male and female inmates within the given institution. The following discussion will consider both outcomes related to post-release adjustment and those related to fulfillment of system level needs.

1. Post-release adjustment. Direct measures of post-release adjustment, such as family stability and sexual adjustment, are conceptually related directly to several of the outcomes anticipated in the reintegration and therapy models of co-corrections. The outcomes which may be related to post-release adjustment include: emotional involvement; appearance and roles; sexual options; assault levels; transfers; institutional milieu; and pregnancies. Although both the reintegration and therapy models of co-corrections anticipate a reduction of post-release adjustment problems and a consequent positive impact on the reduction of criminal activity, no direct measures of post-release adjustment have been taken. Recidivism rates alone indicate little about the quality of life of those released, or the presence of situational factors which may have played a role in a new offense or revocation of parole; however, they constitute the only comparative data which is readily available. Consequently, one may have no alternative to using recidivism as an ersatz measure of post-release adjustment. At the same time, in the absence of adequate measurement of those outcomes presumed to have an impact on post-release behavior, conclusions may not be drawn about which outcomes of co-corrections, if any, lead to a reduction of adjustment problems after release. In

summary, the manner in which the impact of co-correctional programs on post-release behavior has been operationalized allows one to reach no conclusions about which aspects of post-release adjustment have been improved, which outcomes contribute to changes in post-release adjustment, and how post-release adjustment affects recidivism.

The use of recidivism rates as a measure of co-correctional program effectiveness has been hampered by several of the research problems more fully described in Chapter VIII: the absence or incompleteness of recidivism data in a given jurisdiction, the non-comparability of definitions of recidivism, and the passage of an insufficient time-period for the recommended follow-up period to have elapsed. Although recidivism data for all Federal coed institutions will soon be forthcoming, readily available data exists only for those institutions which are generally regarded as the "first stars" on the co-correctional horizon: Fort Worth, and Framingham. In the pioneering study of the Fort Worth FCI, figures were based on the the 281 residents who had been released to the community, including residents who had been released for only six months, as well as those released for over two years, since Fort Worth had not been in existence long enough to have a sizeable two-year cohort. Some of those released for two years may not have been exposed to Fort Worth long enough for the presumed "patterns of change" to have occurred. This recidivism data could not, therefore, be directly compared with the results of the BOP's recidivism study of 1970 releasees, and estimated correction factors were used to allow for some basis of comparison. In the Framingham recidivism studies by Almy et al., Benedict et al.,[23] and Brandon et al.,[24] recidivism was defined as reincarceration for thirty days or more in any Federal or State prison, County House of Correction, or jail, and a distinction was made between new convictions and parole revocations. Initially a six month follow-up period was used, and later this was extended to a period of one year. The definitions of recidivism employed in these studies fail to conform in some respect to the measure recommended by the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, which suggested that: recidivism be measured by reconvictions only, rather than rearrests and/or reconvictions; crimes from all jurisdictions be included in recidivism calculations; measurements include the time period under supervision and three years after; and, incidents other than reconvictions which lead to revocation be separately tabulated.[25] As noted above, however, many jurisdictions generate no recidivism data, and certain drawbacks of the data which is available are a function of the newness of co-corrections, which can only be compensated for by the use of correction factors or appropriate comparative data.

Available recidivism data suggests that co-corrections does have an impact on post-release behavior. The differential analysis of recidivism rates begun by Heffernan and Krippel at Fort Worth initially suggested that females may not profit as much as males from a co-correctional environment; the continuing analysis at Framingham, which involves use of base expectancy scores, consistently suggests the opposite: that females benefit more. The differential analysis of recidivism rates has been continued at Fort Worth, utilizing salient factor scores to predict post-release behavior, and suggests that the levels of post-release criminality by males and females do not differ. The Framingham studies also consider the effects of participation in several programs on recidivism, and although included among these programs are community-linked activities often identified with the co-correctional concept -- furloughs, work-release, study-release, and counseling -- little is revealed by this analysis about the effects of the "coeducational experience." Analyses of the relationship between background variables and post-release behavior for both Fort Worth and Framingham suggest that recidivism

70

may be reduced more for persons with certain characteristics, such as those with drug abuse history. Such findings may only reflect the presence of superior drug treatment programs at these institutions, but could also be supportive of the underlying assumption in the therapy model that drug abusers disproportionately have sex identification problems, and that by the resolution of sex identification problems in a coeducational environment, secondary deviance will also be reduced.

If available data suggests that incarceration in a co-correctional institution has the potential of reducing adjustment problems, it does not convincingly demonstrate the effect of the coeducational experience on post-release behavior. At best, existing data allows one to conclude that some characteristic(s) of those few co-correctional institutions which have been studied reduce(s) recidivism. Whether this characteristic is a high level of "working relationships," as Heffernan and Krippel originally hypothesized, or the presence of other program characteristics associated with other dimensions of institutional life, cannot be determined. Moreover, as noted above, no conclusions can at this time be drawn about which aspects of post-release adjustment are improved by co-corrections, which outcomes contribute to changes in post-release adjustment, and how post-release adjustment affects recidivism.

2. Solution of system level needs. The measurement of the effectiveness of co-corrections for the system, as noted in Chapter VI, is directly related to the particular system needs expected to be served by the introduction of co-corrections. However, as also discussed in Chapter VI, these need to be considered in relation to other unanticipated outcomes, such as changes in staff turnover, institutional milieu, and program participation which may also affect system functioning, and would probably also need to be calculated in determining the costs involved in co-corrections.

As noted in Chapter VIII, the effectiveness of co-corrections as a solution for system-level needs is ordinarily determined in a global manner, by measures of per capita cost reduction, capacity utilization, and program availability. The "costs" attendant to the introduction of males into an underutilized female institution upon overcrowding of women, after a rise in female commitments, may go unnoticed, because of its dissociation from the original purpose of "going coed." Similarly, the impacts of surveillance and sanctions on actual program participation may even go unnoticed where a need for increased program availability provided an incentive - - perhaps backed by the courts - - for the original move.

The outcomes related to solution of system-level needs include the following: facility use in relation to capacity; per capita costs; program utilization; inmate transfers; staff turnover; assault level change; emotional involvement; and pregnancies. No systematic efforts have been made to determine the efficiency of co-corrections in solving system-level needs, or the contributions of the outcomes above to fulfillment of system-level needs. One study by Schweber-Koren[26] shows that the range of programs in institutions occupied by women in the Federal prison system increases in relation to the degree to which an institution becomes sexually integrated. If a goal of implementing co-correctional programs in the Bureau of Prisons was to increase the range of programs available to women - - and the history of Federal involvement in co-corrections supports this view - - then some evidence exists that the range of program offerings has increased to the degree that institutions have become sexually integrated in the Federal system.

Program availability in state institutions also seems to increase when males are introduced to a state's single-sex female institution. However, the lack of a programmatic intent for co-corrections has restricted interest in documenting the impact of co-corrections on institutional operations, and, in turn, the effect of changes in institutional operations on fulfillment of system-level needs. The assessment of the "costs" of co-corrections is further complicated by the bewildering array of cost-accounting procedures used among different jurisdictions, or within the same jurisdiction over time, and the presence of disagreement between institutional business managers and central office or regional budget analysts about the extent to which allocated funds have actually been expended. In summary, the price of co-corrections - - either as a program strategy or a means to fulfill system-level needs - - is a complicated question which has thus far not been addressed.

D. Current Research

Interest in substantiating impressions about the effects of co-corrections has, over the past three years, continued to rise within the Bureau of Prisons parallel to the increasing numbers of Federal inmates housed in coed institutions. Two studies in progress within the Bureau - -Cavior's longitudinal study of Morgantown, and the Bureau-wide study by Burkhead, Cavior and Mabli - - promise to provide the basis for a continuing, systemmatic investigation of co-corrections.

1. The effects of policy changes. Cavior's longitudinal Morgantown study is the first substantial effort to examine the effects of population and policy changes on a coed institution. [27] The stated purpose of the study is to identify critical changes in policy, at both the Bureau and local levels, and determine the effects of these changes on the "personality of the Center." Because a major concern of Cavior's study is the impact of co-corrections on the formerly, and currently, all-male institution, five six-month periods were selected to reflect not only male versus co-correctional periods, but also two different ratios of male to female inmates. Although co-corrections is only one of several variables included in the study, it may nevertheless be regarded as a potentially significant study, in light of the critical importance attributed to changes in policy, on the local and jurisdictional levels, by inmates, staff, and administrators at those coed institutions site-visited during the National Evaluation Program Phase I Assessment of Co-corrections. Cavior's longitudinal study of Morgantown is scheduled for completion at the end of 1977.

2. Towards policy formulation. The coordinated Bureau-wide co-correctional evaluation being undertaken by Burkhead, Cavior and Mabli, emerged in response to a growing need to substantiate general impressions about the advantages and disadvantages of co-corrections. At a co-corrections conference held at the Federal Correctional Institution located on Terminal Island, and attended by administrators and program managers who currently, or in the recent past, were associated with co-correctional institutions, a specific request was made for a research project that would compare co-correctional and single-sex institutions on several variables, including sexual activity; violence and threats of violence; disciplinary transfers "in" and "out;" staff attitudes toward inmates, co-corrections, and their job; furloughs; time served relative to Parole Commission guidelines; drug abuse activity; institution atmosphere; inmate demographic characteristics; and post-release outcomes. In addition, an interest was expressed in

answering questions relevant to operational models of co-corrections, such as the effects of institutional single-sex history; distinct physical separation of housing area by sex; varying degrees of interaction among male and female inmates; and different ratios of male to female inmates.

a. Methodological problems. Several methodological problems were involved in translating these questions into a sound research design. The main three problems were either logistic or conceptual: the practical problems involved in establishing the process by which large amounts of data are collected in a uniform manner in multiple institutions; controlling for inmate differences between co-correctional and single-sex institutions; and, separating the effects due to co-corrections from those due to the myriad of other programs that exist in institutions. The practical problem of developing uniform data collection procedures is being resolved through "changes in priorities and reallocation of resources." The potential effect of inmate differences is controlled by "statistical procedures that adjust the result on the variable in question in such a way that differences among inmate populations are effectively eliminated." The third problem - - isolating the effects of co-corrections - - is one that cannot be resolved with complete satisfaction by matching institutions.

The problem of isolating the effect of co-corrections was seen to involve two tasks: capitalizing on the diversity among coeducational institutions, and selecting appropriate comparison institutions. Even while no two institutions - - one coed, the other single - sex - - are identical programmatically, the diversity among co-correctional institutions in regard to most of the variables of interest presented an advantage. Because the four Federal coed institutions: vary in size of inmate population, the ratio of male to female inmates, average age and age range; have different histories; permit different levels of interaction between male and female inmates; and operate different community programs, the differences which are found between coed and non-coed institutions can be more confidently attributed to co-corrections, rather than to the package of programs with which co-corrections has been commonly associated in the Bureau of Prisons, if the single-sex institutions used as controls are comparable. At the same time, the similarity of three of the four Federal coed institutions in regard to key operational variables - - institutional single-sex history, distinct physical separation of housing, etc. - - disallowed determination of the relative importance of certain operational factors on differences that might be observed among coed institutions. Consequently, such operational questions were excluded generally from the study. Finally, pairs of comparison single-sex instititutions were selected based on inmate age, and their location on a continuum from strict custody to emphasis on community programs.

b. Anticipated results. While several specific methodological problems in the Bureau's study remain unresolved - - the absence of a validated and reliable instrument with which to collect data on homosexuality; the questionableness of using census data as a baseline population for pregnancy rates; the inability to account for subtle inter-institutional differences; and differences in personnel structures and cost-accounting systems between institutions under unit management, and those not - - these problems are relatively minor. The design promises to provide a rich store of basic information about differences between coed and single-sex institutions in terms of inputs (inmate demographic characteristics, the effects on staff and inmate attitudes toward co-corrections of past experience with the concept), insititutional processes (furloughs), outcomes (atmosphere, disciplinary levels, drug abuse levels, rates of homosexuality, pregnancy rates, costs, personality variables), and impacts (recidivism, program availability, and housing of the system's disciplinary problem cases). As the first systematic evaluation of co-corrections, it does not presume it will be "definitive."

One suprising aspect of the design is that the hypotheses are not directional and, in this sense, do not seem to reflect the "state-of-the-art" about certain presumed aspects of co-corrections. For example, hypotheses about differences in inmate populations presumably emerged partially from recent statements that co-corrections is effective only with a selective population; hypotheses about differences in institutional atmosphere and staff-inmate rapport from the theoretical expectation that co-corrections has a positive impact on these areas; hypotheses on drug abuse activity from the common perception that co-corrections, and not the openness of an institution, leads to an increase in drug abuse activity; hypotheses about the number and diversity of programs presumably from the system-level intent that co-corrections serve as a vehicle to increase delivery of non-traditional programs, especially to women. Indeed, there is an implicit direction behind many of the hypotheses. At the same time, many of the hypotheses could not have appropriately been formulated to indicate the anticipated direction of difference. For example, the hypotheses about the handling by coed institutions of their "fair share" of disciplinary problem cases arises both from the assertion on the system-level that coed institutions "foist" their problem cases on other institutions, and the rejoinder by coed institutions that they, in turn, take more than their "fair share" of protection cases. Therefore, not only may the absence of directional hypotheses in the proposal not represent a negative aspect, but, given the need for researchers to appear to have an "open mind" about what they are investigating -- especially in politically sensitive circumstances -- the use of directional hypotheses might have appeared to "beg the question."

The discussion of the synthesized measurement model in Chapter VI emphasized that the imputation of causation is a delicate process and that, in using the model, it is important to determine whether a particular point represents a dependent or independent variable, or may be considered as an intervening or antecedent variable in relation to any given outcome. If these considerations are upper-most when the Bureau's design is reviewed, it is evident that the state-of-the-art in co-correctional evaluation is "off to a good start" but, at the same time, "just out of the blocks." If the Bureau's study indicates differences between coed and single-sex institutions in terms of certain variables, imputation of causation may occur in terms of any of several probable "chains of assumptions." That the Bureau's current study is not articulated in terms of testing one or another model of co-corrections, does not mean that results could not potentially be interpreted in terms of the models. Indeed, the chains of assumptions behind the Bureau's involvement in co-corrections -- partially articulated, shifting and "in a state of tension" as they appear to be -- may be further clarified by the very act of attempting to interpret the "differences" that are observed. The final report for the Bureau's study, excluding recidivism data for the 1977 post-release sample, will be completed by April, 1978. The follow-up report for the 1977 post-release sample will be completed by July, 1978.

c. Unanswered questions. Were the Bureau of Prisons' research design fully implemented, it would provide the basis for a continuing evaluation of co-

corrections. Nevertheless, its results will not be "definitive," and will need substantiation through other research strategies. In addition, the evaluation will provide almost no information on the practices which contribute to differential outcomes, and the effects of different operational models of co-corrections were not included as part of the original design. Certain research topics for future investigation are suggested by the limitations in the Bureau of Prisons design: a demonstration project, operating within a given co-correctional model; a post-release adjustment follow-up, which explores aspects of behavior aside from recidivism; a study of the process of behavior change on living units; and, a more detailed and refined cost-analysis of co-corrections. Before evaluation can be implemented on the state level, efforts must be directed toward development of an adequate data base. Topics for future evaluation of co-corrections are considered further in Chapter IX.

Unfortunately, the full implementation of the Bureau of Prisons' design will apparently be jeopardized by the projected conversion of two of the four participating coed FCI's into single-sex facilities. Removal from the design of institutions to be phased-out would leave only the two similar coed institutions within the design, and pose a major threat to external validity, i.e., the degree to which generalization about the effects of co-corrections can be made across a range of institutions. The maintenance of those institutions in-transition within the design, however, would threaten the internal validity of especially attitudinal data. In either case, by reaching the decision to withdraw two institutions from co-corrections before full implementation of the evaluation design, the Bureau underscored the importance of undertaking co-correctional evaluation at the state level.

VIII. RESEARCH INDICATIONS

A. Data Attainability

While it was impossible during site-visits to obtain a detailed estimate of what data was obtainable at institutions, an effort was made to determine the level of effort which would be required to obtain data. An earlier report attempted to suggest the degree to which data related to specific variables was immediately available, in at least raw form; the interested reader is referred to the General Assessment.

In planning future research efforts in the area of co-corrections, certain basic evaluation problems identified during the study will be encountered. These problems are the subject of the rest of this Chapter.

B. Evaluation Problems

Ten problems related to implementation of co-correctional evaluation designs emerged from reviews of past evaluation efforts and site-visit interviews: the constricted size of the co-correctional universe; the task of separating dimensions; changing priorities and operations; confounding of variables; insufficient passage of time for taking certain crucial measures; insufficient data collection capability; absence of research-orientation; non-comparability of data elements across jurisdictions; sensitivity of officials toward substantive matters; and, lack of instrumentation on the topic of co-corrections.

1. Constricted size of the co-correctional universe. The dispersion of the limited number of coed institutions over a wide geographical area and an almost equal number of jurisdictions hinders access by researchers to the institutions, but, more importantly, has contributed to the difficulty in providing comparative data from other coed institutions. While the wide range of institutions categorized as "co-correctional" might imply that the external validity of research performed within a single institution could be jeopardized, at the same time, the limited number of existing institutions allows the implementation of a research design among a few institutions which permits a high level of generalization.

2. Separating dimensions. The co-correctional program represents one dimension of an institutional environment, and the degree to which co-correctional factors can be isolated and evaluated apart from the total institutional setting is problematic. The problem of separating dimensions was addressed by a staff member at one coed institution who stated that, "separating out the coeducational aspects of an institution is like performing research in parapsychology and defining as a ghost that which does not appear whenever one is looking for it." Until recently, for example, co-corrections at three Federal institutions have been embedded in a package of correctional programs -- all types of community programs, decreased emphasis on security and control, and an emphasis on positive staff-inmate relationships -- which affect institutional atmosphere. As a result, a major issue is the extent to which additional descriptive data about institutional programs must be gathered to provide a

meaningful evaluation framework.

3. Changing priorities and operations. Within a relatively short time-period, there have been constant modifications within the institutions of what may be designated critical variables: sex ratios, age distribution, program content and interaction levels, contact restrictions, use of transfer, and institutional security level. Shifts in goal priorities and institutional operations impede both isolating the phenomenon for study, and even determining measurements of "success" which are appropriate to the circumstances.

4. Confounding of variables. Even where one co-correctional model predominates, there are a plethora of confounded elements to consider. In the discussion above about separating dimensions, the isolation of co-corrections' effects on institutional environment -- within a structure which includes other elements presumed to engender a more normal institutional environment - was presented as problematic. Similarly, if dress codes are implemented in an institution which also permits male-female interaction, it is difficult to determine how these factors contribute to changes in appearance. Where several partially articulated and partially implemented models are simultaneously in effect, the problem of confounding is even greater. Are inmates attracted and held by the ambience and low security status of coed institutions, or by the presence of the opposite sex? If the presence of subcultures in coed institutions is rare, is it because such homosexual subcultures are circumvented by the continuity of heterosexual options, or because subcultures are more appropriate to longer-term institutions? Due to other research problems commonly impinging on research in co-corrections, those circumstances in which confounded variables are present need to be conceptually isolated, even if they cannot be empirically separated. Two significant related problems involve "teasing out" the "costs" of co-corrections, and separating the components of certain complex behaviors, e.g., the staff member's writing up an inmate versus the inmate's being written up.

5. Time-frames. Many important measures for the programmatic models of co-corrections cannot be taken for most institutions, because co-corrections is such a new phenomenon, and measurement requires the passage of time. Because most coed institutions came into being in 1974 and 1975, a sufficient time period has not elapsed subsequent to the release of inmates from these institutions to allow use of the three year recidivism measure recommended by the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. Even the more common two-year follow up -- recommended in the explication of the measurement model -- is applicable to only a small percentage of inmates from these institutions. In evaluation of the earliest coed institutions, in which time-tied measurements, such as recidivism data, have been used, it has been necessary to initially use shorter and more variable time periods -- six months, a year, six to eighteen months, etc. -- and to extend the follow-up as data became available. A second effect of the newness of co-corrections is that study cohorts -- especially initial ones -- include many persons who have been minimally exposed to the co-correctional setting, such that certain presumed effects of co-corrections might be less likely to have occurred.

6. Insufficient data collection capability. In none of the state institutions visited was there either a research office, or a staff member whose functions primarily

involved development of data collection procedures. In most cases, the jurisdiction in which these institutions were located either did not have a research office at the departmental level, or its functions were identified more with "survival" matters, such as computation of population projections, staffing requirements, and payroll. This general lack of data collection capability might be partially compensated for, if co-corrections is viewed as a program, and if what data is collected exists in a form which is comparable to at least some other single-sex institutions within, and coed institutions outside, the jurisdiction.

7. Absence of research orientation. Because implementation of co-corrections has often involved minimal programmatic intent, interest in documenting the results of the male-female presence and interaction has been absent. Indeed, where fulfillment of system-level needs is perceived as the goal of "going coed," there is an interest in seeing that the male-female presence has the least effect possible on normal institutional operations. Achievement of most system-level goals is grossly estimated, e.g., per capita costs were decreased, capacity utilization increased, etc. Institutional outcomes are conceptualized in terms of minimizing rates of pregnancy, sexual assault, and emotional involvement. However, since an interest exists in seeing that co-corrections has the "least effect," data related to these outcomes may go unrecorded or unreported. The research director in one state corrections department complained that he could not obtain valid data on pregnancies, because such incidents were covered up: "They spirit them out, give them an abortion, and then put them on furlough status as a reward for keeping their mouths shut." This orientation away from research may exist both toward substantive matters, and research in general.

8. Non-comparability of data. Sets of data may be non-comparable either among institutions or within a given institution. Data may be collected or measurement states defined in a manner which defies making comparisons across jurisdictional lines. The wide range of formulas for calculating recidivism represents one of the most crucial cross-jurisdictional disparities affecting research on co-corrections, to which may be added cross-jurisdicitonal differences in categorization of incident reports, and a bewildering array of cost-accounting systems. Moreover, data collection procedures and definitions of key measurement states may have changed within a given jurisdiction over time, or data may be partially collected by two different offices in the same institution in a non-comparable manner. In addition, significant differences between jurisdictions, or within a given institution at different points in time, may invalidate cross-comparisons, regardless of comparability in terms of certain critical variables. Consequently, even if statistical procedures are used to adjust for differences among inmate populations, there may be institutional factors which can not so easily be resolved, and other factors which do not facilitate determining the adequacy of comparison groups.

9. Sensitivity toward substantive matters. Sensitivity of correctional officials toward substantive matters may be generally associated with the levels of population pressure currently experienced by most correctional jurisdictions, but is especially endemic to co-corrections because of a perceived lower tolerance by the "public" for heterosexual contact "between criminals" living "behind the walls" who are supported by "the public dole." While homosexual activity may be perceived as part of the prisoner's "unnatural lot," it was also apparent during site-visits that heterosexual contact "in the joint" may be considered more offensive to "society's values" than predatory, homosexual

activity. In either case, sensitivity toward substantive matters, such as contact policy and implementation, and changes over time in both policies and "institutional flavor," can impede receptiveness to the data collection effort.

10. Lack of instrumentation. The dearth of instrumentation either specifically designed for research in coed institutions, or adaptable for taking certain measurements in the coed setting, further inhibits evaluation. Some efforts have been made to develop instrumentation useful in research on co-corrections. Cavior and Cohen have developed and tested a scale to assess resident and staff attitudes toward co-corrections in two coed and two male institutions.[28] Cavior and Cohen stress, however, that the scale is for descriptive and program purposes, rather than for evaluative use. In addition, the scale does not tap differential perceptions of staff and inmates toward desirable sex-role behavior within the institution. Instrumentation for measuring levels and types of sexual activity would also be invaluable in certain types of co-correctional research designs.

IX. EVALUATION INDICATIONS

Because the Bureau of Prisons' co-correctional research project in progress offers the prospect of yielding a rich source of data, the implementation of another full-scale research design is appropriately deferred until the results of that study have been analyzed, and further research questions refined. Nevertheless, several partial investigations may serve to extend the Federal effort, or complement previous or ongoing research. Chapter IX broadly outlines several such potential research designs. These designs or research topics have been subsumed under two broad purposes: improvements to the utility of the data base; and, determining the effects of co-corrections. Another design which has repeatedly been recommended, and will eventually warrant implementation, would involve a comparative study of the effects of coeducational versus single-sex confinement across several types of institutional settings, including prisons, mental hospitals, hospitals, prison camps, and the armed forces.

A. Designs to Improve Utility of Data

1. Development of a data base. One glaring gap in knowledge about co-corrections is caused by the inconsistency in record-keeping and lack of comparability of data, among and within jurisdictions, and even within single institutions. The de-emphasis on research, the often low programmatic intent for the establishment of co-corrections, and the occasional existence of separate administrative divisions for provision of some services (e.g. education, counselling) contribute to these impediments to data collection. A project to identify and standardize data at all existing coed institutions might be developed to partially remedy this problem. A team of researchers, spending several weeks or months at each facility, would interview staff and determine all offices in the institution which keep records, and would examine those records to determine their application to the synthesized measurement model.

In addition, the team would compare data both within institutions over time, and among different jurisdictions. The project would develop procedures to facilitate the standardization of dissimilar data, and distinguish areas, such as disciplinary reports and job classifications, in which definitions may vary so much as to impinge on the comparability of seemingly compatible data. The team would strive to integrate the data as fully as possible with that generated by the Federal effort in progress.

2. Establishment of uniformity in computerized data systems. Two visited institutions operated terminals connected to their jurisdictions' computerized data retreival systems, a practice which may become widespread; however, institutional use of these systems was limited to record-keeping and management. In the institutions, little was known about research capabilities of the computers, and it was therefore unclear whether the systems could contribute to research on co-corrections. At the jurisdictional level, the principal use for the systems was to determine information necessary for management decisions, such as offender population projection, payroll, etc., and not to perform more esoteric research. A second potential design would develop a team of researchers in corrections and computer science to determine the utility of the present data retrieval systems for research. This team would be

responsible for identifying all data presently available in storage banks; it would also determine its comparability. While such a project would require close cooperation with jurisdictional authorities, it is expected that benefits from the project, through enhancement of computer capabilities, would be an incentive for participation. However, a study of this type might more appropriately occur after, or in tandem with, the National Evaluation Program's Phase I Assessment of Correctional Data Systems.

B. Designs to Determine Effects of Co-corrections

1. Demonstration project. Another impediment to research has been the lack of consistency and uniformity within individual projects. A result of the frequent changes in coed programs has been the inability of evaluators to rigorously analyze outcomes of co-corrections, because of fluctuations in potentially crucial variables and intrusion of other factors into the institutional process. In addition, the wide variety of programmatic and non-programmatic justifications for co-corrections, often existent within the same institution, further complicates the isolation of outcomes resulting from co-corrections.

The development of a "model institution" with stable programs and goals, for a period of time sufficient for adequate data on institutional processes and outcomes to be collected, could partially alleviate the problem. Such a design would first entail determination of the most important or useful programs, policies, outcomes, etc. which would be studied. The model would control as many significant variables as possible, including staff selection and training, inmate selection and characteristics, policies on contact, interaction levels, community linkages, nature and extent of programs, etc. An operational framework for the institution could be derived from the logic models in Chapter V, or a given model operationalized in its present form. The model project would include methods to monitor implementation and maintenance of each variable at the determined level. An effective method of insuring implementation might be to tie continued funding of the project to the maintenance of the desired consistency and uniformity. The model project would have an extensive data collection and evaluation design built into it and provision would be made for extensive follow-up of releasees from the model institution. Ideally, selection of the institution for such a model project would also be based on its comparability to other, non-coed institutions for control purposes. While all facets of institutional life could not be compatible, the control institution would necessarily duplicate as closely as possible all aspects of the reintegration model upon which the model institution would be based, with the exception of the presence of both sexes. Such a model program would provide previously unavailable data on the effects of co-corrections, and limit the present confounding of variables caused by the simultaneous presence of several models.[29]

2. Post-release adjustment follow-up. Studies of the behavior of inmates released from co-correctional facilities are sparse. The present state of research not only generally lacks comparisons of recidivism rates between coed and single-sex facilities; it is devoid of information about other aspects of post-release adjustment. Recidivism measures do not permit a determination of the quality of life of the releasee, nor, more importantly, do they indicate either which co-correctional outcomes have an effect on post-release adjustment, or how post-release adjustment affects recidivism.

A post-release follow-up might be designed which develops large comparable cohorts from releasees from several coed and single-sex institutions. The great diversity in characteristics and geographical location among coed institutions should lend itself to the identification of comparable single-sex institutions. The project would then interview the selected releasees, preferably at several intervals after release. Interviews would include a examination of social and sexual adjustment of releasees, drug usage, job satisfaction and tenure, child care, marital stability, etc. Results would be tabulated and significant differences in post-release adjustment identified. The project might also include collection of data on recidivism from parole officers and other State and Federal criminal justice agencies, as a means of further validating self-report data. A post-release follow-up of this sort could yield a clearer perception of the actual effects of co-correctional outcomes on post-release adjustment, and of post-release adjustment on recidivism.

3. Study of on-unit behavior changes. Even more scarce than investigations of recidivism are rigorous investigations of co-corrections' influence on behavior. Although a "softening" effect on the violence of prison life is a widely-perceived outcome and an intended goal of many coed institutions, little hard evidence has been collected which would document such an effect. Moreover, changes in self-identity and sex roles are difficult to document. The multiplicity of intervening variables prevents the facile determination of actual, on-unit behavior changes from comparisons of disciplinary rates and other management-oriented data. A potential alternative design would measure behavioral changes on-unit for suitable periods before and after the introduction of co-corrections at an institution. Such a project would necessitate identification of an institution which is "going coed" well before actual implementation of the program. The design calls for an intensive analysis of the social dynamics of at least one unit of the facility, including levels of interaction (both inmate/inmate and staff/inmate), identification of social systems within the unit, perceived levels of homosexuality, etc. Data might be obtained through a combination of methods, including surveys, interviews and observation. Study of the unit would continue through and beyond the introduction of the opposite sex to the institution. It is desirable that other variables such as program availability, staff-inmate ratio, etc. remain reasonably constant; however, the effects of policy-change on on-unit behavior might alternatively be examined. The project would investigate effects of co-corrections on on-unit behavior, as exemplified through changes in social structure; "cliques"; presence of and status of homosexuals on the unit; the nature of on-unit relationships; nature and level of violence; and levels of interaction among unit members and between unit members and staff.

4. Cost-analysis of co-corrections. Despite the perceived importance of financial benefits and costs in the decision to "go coed," little actual evidence has been collected in this area. One reason for this lack is the additional administrative load which might result from separate accounting for each sex. At the same time, co-corrections is potentially susceptible to "hidden costs" stemming from subtle and difficult-to-measure items, such as shifts in staff responsibilities, changes in program participation rates and thus per capita program costs, and benefits from inmate labor. Furthermore, additional costs from co-corrections, such as those incurred in possible high staff turnover rates, limited program participation etc., are even more difficult to delineate. An intensive study of data concerning the costs and benefits of co-corrections at several institutions could alleviate this lack of knowledge. Experts in cost-analysis

could be employed to examine changes in per capita expenditures in several facets of prison operations. The project would examine costs in each department or division of the institution; emphasis would be placed on data in other than monetary form, such as increases or decreases in labor, materials, etc. In this way, budget changes which result from inflation could be isolated. Job analysis would measure changes in job responsibilities, such as an increased focus on security, which may result from co-corrections. The study would carefully note cases in which increased costs might be associated with intended outcomes, such as when increases in a program's budget reflect a higher participation rate resulting from co-corrections. Changes in labor costs, supplies and facility modification would be carefully delineated, and this data would be compared across institutions to determine which costs and benefits are incurred, and under what conditions.

X. NATIONAL POLICY AND OPERATIONS

The correspondence between national policy pronouncements about the functions and operational objectives related to a given program, and the actual state-of-affairs, is important to both evaluation and policy-development in a program area. In the case of co-corrections, no real national policy exists or is likely to be articulated in the near future. Therefore, a key question is the divergence between the expectations and operational targets enunciated by the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, and what actually occurs in the field. However, the "chain of default" continues through policy statements made (or deferred) by jurisdictional directors, institutional administrators, and along the line to the direct implementation.

A. Articulation of a National Policy

When the Standards and Goals Commission's recommendations on co-corrections were formulated and presented, they were offered in the context of a discussion of the status of women in major institutions, and were implicitly conceptualized as a variant on "women's corrections." The potential impact of coeducational correctional institutions for the system, in terms of provision of meaningful programming for female offenders and expansion of career opportunities for women in the field, was clearly as important, if not more so, than the potential programmatic effects of a mixed population. Indeed, when the Commission's recommendations were drawn up, experience with co-correctional settings had been confined almost entirely to juvenile institutions, among them the first Federal experiment with co-corrections at the Kennedy Youth Center. The only existing adult coed institution at the time -- unless the former state institution for women at Muncy, Pennsylvania, which had introduced several older men to perform farm labor, is counted -- was the FCI at Fort Worth. It is evident, therefore, that the Commission's recommendations regarding the functions and operations of co-correctional facilities grew from the experience with juvenile co-corrections, the first hopeful observations of co-corrections during the "days of peace and love" at Fort Worth, and the intuition that something else had to be tried. From these early experiences were derived the basic premises that co-correctional institutions could provide the healthy opposite sex relationships and adequate program structure lacking in single-sex institutions.

The Commission's statement on co-corrections included a partially-articulated theory of the programmatic and system-level effects of co-corrections, a mandate to convert single-sex institutions to coed facilities during the ensuing five year period wherever design proved adaptable and populations comparable, as well as specific operational guidelines. In the following discussion, first the relationships between the expectations outlined by the Commission and predominant models of co-corrections, and second, the implementation level of the Commission's operational guidelines, will be considered. Following that will be a brief discussion of the implementation of both jurisdictional policy and operational guidelines.

B. Implementation of Standards and Goals' Models of Co-corrections

The theories of co-corrections outlined by the Commission reflected a mixed intent, partially programmatic, and partially non-programmatic. The main programmatic theory of co-corrections reflected a therapy model. The therapy model is exhibited in assertions such as: "The coeducational program can be an invaluable tool for exploring and dealing with the social and emotional problems related to identity conflicts that many offenders experience." The emphasis on therapy is tinged with an interest in normalizing the institutional environment, and reducing the destructive effects of incarceration: "Institutional programs that provide a single-sex social experience contribute to maladaptive behavior in the institution and in the community. In sexually segregated facilities it is very difficult for offenders, particularly juveniles and youth, to develop positive, healthy relationships with the opposite sex."[30] The non-programmatic theory of co-corrections has been already stated above: that mixing populations will serve as a means to the ends of increasing both the delivery of meaningful programs to females, and the participation of women in corrections.

Neither the programmatic nor non-programmatic models of co-corrections expressed by the Commission correspond to the predominant models articulated by existing co-correctional communities during site-visits. The therapy model of co-corrections seems to have been embraced less than either normalization/reintegration, or institutional control. Similarly, the non-programmatic expectations of the Commission have not been generally reflected throughout the proliferation of coed institutions, except perhaps in the Federal system, where co-corrections was expected to serve the non-programmatic system-level need for expanded program options for women. Indeed, even if the level of program availability for women in state coed institutions has secondarily been increased by co-corrections, the intent behind sexual integration of state prisons seems to have been geared to the expansion of program opportunities for women in only about four cases; and where the expansion of program opportunities has occurred elsewhere, it has apparently been largely an incidental effect of the expansion of programs for introduced males. The primary non-programmatic focus of co-corrections has not been program expansion for either sex, but the utilization of available space and reduction of per capita costs. In a broader sense, however, because each logic model of co-corrections appears to exist simultaneously with the other models in any given co-correctional institution, it cannot be said that any model is without application in a particular case.

C. Implementation of Standards and Goals' Operational Guidelines

The Commission also articulated operational guidelines which generally correspond to its expectations for co-corrections: a therapeutic setting, and a means to integrate both correctional programs and staffs. The Commission proposed that the following operation procedures be adopted:[31]

- "Classification and diagnostic procedures . . . should give consideration to offenders' problems with the opposite sex."
- "Coeducational programs should be provided to meet those needs (with regard to the opposite sex)."
- "Programs. . . should be open to both sexes."

- "Staff of both sexes should be hired who have interest, ability, and training in coping with the problems of both male and female offenders."

- "Assignments of staff and offenders to programs and activities should not be based on the sex of either."

The operational guidelines above have been no better than partially implemented. Because co-corrections has infrequently been operated within a therapy model, classification and diagnostic procedures in both State and Federal systems have given little systematic consideration to "offenders' problems with the opposite sex," aside from general efforts to "turn people around," that is, to reduce situational homosexuality. Similarly, regarding only a few institutions could it be said that programs were significantly structured to deal with these problems. Moreover, because co-correctional institutions have almost always inherited a staff -- from either the former single-sex institution, or, in the case of two Federal institutions, from former Public Health Service Hospitals -- and because of a reportedly high level of jurisdictional control by old-line Civil Service Commissions over staff hiring, most emerging coed institutions have had a restricted hand in hiring staff who have "interest, ability, and training in coping with the problems of both male and female offenders." However, programs generally do appear to be open in coed institutions to both sexes -- and increasingly so over time, although inmate organizations and unsupervised work details often continue to be segregated. An important consideration with respect to the openness of programs is the possibility of the denial of program access to one or both sexes by the implementation of often unanticipated movement restrictions, applicable by both time and place, and a general analagous restriction of unstructured contact in many institutions. While some measure of staff integration seems to have accompanied "going coed" in all coed institutions, the assignment of staff is still limited, in custodial positions particularly and in state institutions generally, by the expectation that staff and inmate alike require protection from potential assault from persons of the opposite sex, as well as by defining privacy in dormitory and toilet facilities as excluding staff of the opposite sex.

In addition to these institutional operational objectives, the Commission also outlined certain system-level operational goals: the extension of the co-correctional concept to all state institutions of adaptable design and comparable populations, and implementation of interstate arrangements where the number of women was insufficient to allow implementation of separate programs in individual jurisdictions. Neither of these objectives seems to have been deliberately pursued. Many states have converted single-sex institutions to co-corrections, but with limited consideration of "comparable populations," and minimal examination of what this phrase might even mean. No interstate arrangements for operation of a coed institution have been developed or, as far as is known, actively sought.

D. Implementation of Jurisdictional Policy

Not only do the recommendations of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals on co-corrections not represent a true "national policy," but rarely has either a jurisdiction or an institution issued a "policy" outlining the anticipated benefits of co-corrections. Policies reflecting both theoretical and operational concerns have shifted rapidly -- partly in response to changing system-level needs, and partly through the process of "determining the limits and center" of a program as potentially innovative as co-corrections. However, the relationship between operational shifts and readjustments in expectations have generally not been indicated. Even within the Federal system, where the programmatic intent for co-corrections has been high -- as a means of aiding reintegration, and, to a lesser degree, dealing with problems of sexual identification -- a shift in policy has been evident: away from reintegration and therapy models of co-corrections, and toward institutional control and alternate choice models. Corresponding to shifts in expectations have been shifts in operations: the use of transfer, the selectivity of admission requirements, implementation of contact policy, and so on. In the absence of clearly articulated expectations in both Federal and State institutions, debates about the actual and ideal operations of a given institution will almost inevitably continue.

XI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Conclusions

A number of assumptions have been entertained about the functions to be served by, and the potential benefits to be derived from, co-corrections: the reduction of institutional control problems, smoothing out the process of reintegration into the the "free world," the development of heterosexual coping skills and clarification of sex-identities, as well as the realization of economies of scale, relief of overcrowding, and achievement of other inmate- and system-centered objectives. At the same time, concern has been expressed about possible adverse consequences of co-corrections: upon women, upon those who were" already there," and on community relationships.

However, the underlying concepts behind coeducational corrections are relatively simple. Corresponding to the non-programmatic and programmatic purposes for the integration of incarcerated men and women, are two basic concepts, neither of which is necessarily valid in all circumstances:

- Two can live as cheaply as one; and
- Male and female need each other.

Derived from these basic concepts are the expectations that the presence of men and women in institutions used to capacity will serve the system economy, and that the interaction of incarcerated men and women will have positive effect on institutional functioning, or the inmates' lives.

The spread of co-corrections, since its introduction in 1971, has been rapid, and has often been received as one of several system-level adjustments. The implementation of co-corrections has generally been preceeded by scrutinizing the concept as a programmatic strategy, although the actual move into co-corrections has often been precipitated by a situation unrelated to the programmatic functions of co-corrections.

The process of implementation has often been one of trial-and-error, and most coed institutions have continued to "flex" with the vicissitudes of system-level need. Where decisions have been reached to phase-out co-corrections, they have generally been premised on pressures to maximally use available space, and not on dissatisfaction with the concept of co-corrections.

Co-corrections has been implemented amidst fears of pregnancy, sexual assault, and emotional involvement; and, as a result, heavy external controls have often been applied, in the form of surveillance and sanctions. However, even where a minimum of external controls has been applied, and co-corrections has been valued for its effects on institutional life, it has often been suggested that "it develops a normal atmosphere, but then extracts the normal consequences of that atmosphere."

The amount and sophistication of evidence available to support the several "chains-of-assumptions" which have evolved to explain the effects of coeducational confinement, is limited. Past research generally indicates that co-corrections may, indeed, reduce institutional violence, improve atmosphere, and curb post-release criminality; however, many of the presumed causal links remain unexamined, the first rigorous investigations of co-corrections are only now being initiated, and no conclusions can be drawn with certitude. No firm statement can be made at this time, therefore, about the success or failure of co-corrections to fulfill any set of expectations.

B. Recommendations

Several recommendations for further research in the area of co-corrections have been suggested, to both improve the utility of the data base, and extend the state-of-knowledge regarding certain effects of co-corrections.

This Phase I Assessment of coeducational corrections also suggests a number of additional recommendations:

- Prospective implementers should keep in mind that co-corrections is still an exploratory concept, which has only begun to be systematically investigated. Nevertheless, despite the "trial-and-error" basis which has often characterized development of coed institutions, the body of experience regarding co-corrections is wide enough that potential implementers should take it into account. Efforts should be made to clearly delineate the thrust and intent of a given program, that is, to develop a definition of what the coed situation is to accomplish.

- Both potential implementers and administrators of existing institutions should determine on which co-correctional models they are operating, and should isolate points at which expectations are in conflict. However, because disparate expectations stem from divergent concepts of both criminality and the functions of incarceration, these differences do not necessarily need to be reconciled. Algorithms should be developed to represent the activities and desired outcomes in a given institution.

- The logical structure which describes a given institution should be used to monitor selected institutional processes.

- When co-corrections is perceived to be a potential solution to system-level problems -- both underutilization and overcrowding -- prior consideration should be given to long-range population projections for both sexes, and potential alternatives to "juggling" populations. Where a single-sex institution is underutilized, consideration should be given to either moving the occupants to a smaller single-sex institution, or redefining the security level of the institution to permit introduction of more offenders of the same sex, as well as to co-corrections. Otherwise, one runs the risk of later precipitating abrupt changes or reversals in programs.

- Jurisdictions containing low numbers of female offenders, but interested in utilizing co-corrections as a program strategy, should be more aggressive in pursuing development of inter-jurisdictional arrangements.

- States should not be inhibited from establishing coed institutions by the belief that only the Bureau of Prisons has the resources necessary for coeducational programs. Presently, states are operating coed facilities over as wide a range of institutional characteristics as is the Bureau of Prisons.

- Whenever possible, women should be afforded the same choice of single-sex or coed confinement that is offered to male offenders. The presence of a choice reconciles two arguments: on the one hand, that female offenders should have an opportunity to develop apart from male-influence in an essentially male-dominated correctional system; and, on the other hand, that "normal" society contains both sexes, and that co-corrections offers opportunities to adjust to two-sex society in a controlled setting. In order to provide the option of single-sex confinement to women in jurisdictions operating coed institutions, inter-jurisdictional arrangements will frequently have to be developed, ordinarily with either other states, or local institutions.

- Consideration should be given to the rationales given for the necessity of any particular proscriptions of physical and social contact. It should be noted that a rigid and restrictive contact policy, with the consequent feedback phenomenon of evasion and intensified control, appears to result in both staff and inmate tension, and in diversion of energies from other institutional goals and programs.

- Consideration should be given to development of means to support internally-generated controls. The provision of community activities and/or institutional programs, to provide alternate relationships and alternate uses of time and attention, should be considered as potentially more constructive in a co-correctional setting than the use of high levels of surveillance and sanctions.

- Consideration should be given to the degree of "normalization" which is possible with regard to heterosexual relationships. For example, where statutes do not prohibit administrative changes in the matter, institutions should review policies on inmate marriage and marital rights.

- Consideration should be given to whether tendencies to control the institution through differential restrictions on either sex, or in regard to interracial, inter-ethnic, or inter-class relationships, are present.

- Wherever possible, sanctions for violations by males and females should be equal. If transfer is regarded as a significant tool in effecting institutional control, males and females should be equally subject to transfer. In most jurisdictions, the provision of a single-sex institution to which women may be transferred will require development of inter-jurisdictional arrangements, on either state or local levels.

- LEAA funding to programs in coed institutions should not exclude inmates of either sex, except where bona fide justifications are present; for example, women's consciousness raising is not a program for which a presumption exists that access should be provided to males. LEAA should also tie continued funding to the maintenance of sexually non-discriminatory policies on program participation.

- Coed institutions should work in conjunction with the jurisdiction's civil service commission to develop standards and selection procedures for staff hiring, which account for the interest in working, and ability to work, with offenders of both sexes.

- In-service training programs should be developed to work with staff in developing and clarifying the policies and desired outcomes for co-corrections, in order that staff may more effectively work to fulfill them.

- Care should be taken to insure that, in the change-over of women's institutions to co-correctional status, the highest administrative positions in the correctional system are open to women.

NOTES

1. National Evaluation Program, "Report on activities," unpublished paper, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, December, 1976.

2. F. C. Gray, Prison discipline in America, (London, J. Murray, 1847), pp. 15-16.

3. Dorothea L. Dix, Prisons and prison discipline in the United States, (New Jersey: Patterson Smith, 1845), pp. 107-108.

4. Katherine W. Burkhart, Women in prison, (Garden City: Doubleday, 1973).

5. Ralph R. Arditi, Frederick Goldberg, M. Martha Hartle, John H. Peters, and William R. Phelps, "The sexual segregation of American prisons," Yale Law Journal, 1973, 82, pp. 1229-1273.

6. Charles F. Campbell, "Co-corrections - - FCI Fort Worth after three years," unpublished paper, U. S. Bureau of Prisons, no date, p. 2.

7. U. S. Bureau of Prisons, Monday Morning Highlights, (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Justice), May 9, 1977. State figures are based on the assumption that five percent of those incarcerated at the state level is female.

8. James G. Ross, Esther Heffernan, James R. Sevick, and Ford T. Johnson, Issues Paper: Phase I Evaluation of Coeducational Corrections, (Washington, D.C.: Koba Associates, Inc., 1977), p. 49.

9. Ibid., p. 25

10. CONSAD Research Corporation, Bureau of Prisons female and co-correctional addict client outcome evaluation, (Pittsburgh: CONSAD Research Corporation, 1975).

11. Esther Heffernan and Elizabeth Krippel, "Final report on research: Fort Worth FCI," unpublished report, U. S. Bureau of Prisons, March, 1975.

12. Joellen Lambiotte, "Sex role differentiation in a co-correctional setting," unpublished masters' thesis, University of California at Santa Barbara, January, 1977.

13. Jane Patrick, "Doing time: an ethnography of a co-correctional institution," unpublished report, U. S. Bureau of Prisons, May, 1976.

14. Jane Patrick and M. McCurdy, "Women's unit ethnographic study: Fort Worth FCI," unpublished report, U. S. Bureau of Prisons, 1975.

15. John O. Smykla, "A phenomenological analysis of the social environment in a coed prison," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, Lansing, Michigan, 1977.

16. Linda Almy, Vikki Bravo, Leslie Burd, Patricia Chin, Linda Cohan, Frank Gallo, Anthony Giorgianni, Jeffrey Gold, Mark Jose, and John Noyes, "Study of a coeducational facility," unpublished masters' thesis, Boston University, 1975.

17. Helene E. Cavior, "Evaluation of co-corrections in the Federal Bureau of Prisons: a research proposal," unpublished research proposal, no data.

18. Edith E. Flynn, "Fort Worth and Framingham: report for the Harvard Center for Criminal Justice," unpublished manuscript, no date.

19. Esther Heffernan, "Research design for Fort Worth FCI study," unpublished research proposal, U. S. Bureau of Prisons, March, 1973.

20. Dorothy Jackson, "Resident socialization and interpersonal relations in the Fort Worth Correctional Institution," unpublished research proposal, March, 1973.

21. Francis J. Carney, Jr. was the thesis advisor for the three Boston University studies: Almy et al., Benedict et al., Brandon et al. He is also Director of Research for the Massachusetts Department of Corrections.

22. John D. Burkhead, Helene E. Cavior, and Jerome Mabli, "A comparison of two approaches to incarceration: co-correctional and single-sex institutions," unpublished research proposal, U. S. Bureau of Prisons, May, 1977.

23. Paul E. Benedict, Carolyn Brewer, Juliana Mathews, Joseph Polhemus, Sharon Schwarz, Layne C. Suss, Robin Teicholz, Dolores Thomas, Jan Tuemmler, Alan Tweedy, and Curtis Wilkins, "The effects of a coeducational facility: a continued analysis," unpublished masters' thesis, Boston University, 1976.

24. Nancy Brandon, Barbara Carson, Steve Disenhof, Amy Eden, Ros Gurtler, Barbara Lipps, Sally Menkel and Lexie Williams," A study in a coeducational correctional facility: differential effects of psychotherapy and other programs," unpublished masters" thesis, Boston University, 1977.

25. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, op. cit., pp. 528-530.

26. Claudine Schweber-Koren, "Integration and education: a study of the education of adult women in the Federal prisons, 1975-1976," unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1977.

27. Helene E. Cavior, "The Kennedy Center: a research proposal," unpublished research proposal, U. S. Bureau of Prisons, September, 1976.

28. Helene E. Cavior and Stanley H. Cohen, "The development of a scale to assess resident and staff attitudes towards co-corrections," unpublished paper, January, 1977.

29. The final meeting of the project's Advisory Board underscored the importance of developing and implementing a "differential" model of co-corrections. Cross-cultural perspectives were added through a discussion of Scandinavian coed institutions, which permit sexual activity between consenting inmates, and between inmates and visitors.

30. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, *Corrections*, (Washington, D.C.: Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 1973), P. 379.

31. Ibid., pp. 378-379.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Almy, L., Bravo, V., Burd, L., Chin, P., Cohan, L., Gallo, F., Georgianni, A., Gold, J., Jose, M., and Noyes, J. Study of a coeducational correctional facility. Unpublished masters' thesis, Boston University, 1975.

Arditi, R.R., Goldberg, F., Hartle, M.M., Peters, J. H. and Phelps, W.R. The sexual segregation of American prisons. Yale Law Journal, 1973, 82, 1229-1273.

Baunach, P. J. and Murton, T. O. Women in prison: an awakening minority. Crime and Corrections, 1973, 1, 4-12.

Benedict, P.E., Brewer, C., Matthews, J., Polhemus, J., Schwartz, S., Suss, L.C., Teicholz, R., Thomas, D., Tuemmler, J., Tweedy, A. & Wilkins, C. The effects of a coeducational facility: a continued analysis. Unpublished masters' thesis, Boston University, 1976.

Brandon, N., Carson, B., Disenhof, S., Eden, A., Gurtler, R., Lipps, B., Menkel, S., and Williams, L. A study in a coeducational correctional facility: differential effects of psychotherapy and other programs. Unpublished masters' thesis, Boston University, 1977.

Burkhead, J.D., Cavior, H. E., and Mabli, J. A comparison of two approaches to incarceration: co-correctional and single-sex institutions. Unpublished research proposal, U.S. Bureau of Prisons, 1977.

Campbell, C. F. Co-corrections - - FCI Fort Worth after three years. Unpublished paper, U.S. Bureau of Prisons, no date.

Cavior, H.E. A survey of student reaction to a coed Federal youth institution: the Robert F. Kennedy Youth Center. Unpublished paper, U.S. Bureau of Prisons, October, 1972.

Cavior, H. E. The Kennedy Center: a research proposal. Unpublished research proposal, U.S. Bureau of Prisons, September, 1976.

Cavior, H.E. Evaluation of co-corrections in the Federal Bureau of Prisons: a research proposal. Unpublished research proposal, U.S. Bureau of Prisons, no date.

Cavior, H. E. and Cohen, S.H. The development of a scale to assess resident and staff attitudes towards co-corrections. Unpublished paper, January, 1977.

Coed cons. Ebony, 1973, 29 (1), 193.

Co-corrections phased out at Kennedy Youth Center. Highlights. Federal Bureau of Prisons, February 17, 1975.

Coed corrections in Fort Worth. Target Newsletter. National League of Cities, U.S. Conference of Mayors, 1975.

Coeducational prison is a test in rehabilitation. New York Times. July 8, 1972, M 27.

Connecticut is going coed. New York Times. May 27, 1973.

CONSAD Research Corporation. Bureau of Prisons female and co-correctional addict client outcome evaluation. Pittsburgh: CONSAD Research Corporation, 1975.

Crawford, J. K. Two losers don't make a winner. The Grapevine, American Association of Wardens and Superintendents, November - December, 1975, 8 (2), 1-3.

Flynn, E. E. Fort Worth and Framingham: Report for the Harvard Center for Criminal Justice. Unpublished manuscript, no date.

Glick, R. M. and Neto, V. V. National study of women's correctional programs. Sacramento: California Youth Authority, 1975.

Heffernan, E. Making it in prison: the square, the cool and the life. New York: Wiley-Interscience, 1972.

Heffernan, E. Research design for Fort Worth FCI study. Unpublished research proposal, U. S. Bureau of Prisons, March, 1973.

Heffernan, E. Interim report on research: Fort Worth FCI. Unpublished paper, U.S. Bureau of Prisons, April, 1974.

Heffernan, E. Co-corrections: some questions to be asked. Proceedings of the tenth annual interagency workshop of the Institute of Contemporary Corrections and the Behavioral Sciences. Huntsville, Texas: Sam Houston State University, June, 1975.

Heffernan, E. and Krippel, E. Final report on research: Fort Worth FCI. Unpublished report, U.S. Bureau of Prisons, March, 1975.

Jackson, D. Resident socialization and interpersonal relationships in the Fort Worth Correctional Institution. Unpublished research proposal, March, 1973.

Jones, C. Prisons go co-ed but mostly out of economic necessity. Christian Science Monitor. February 14, 1975.

Karacki, L. Kennedy Youth Center student response to a coed questionnaire. Unpublished paper, U.S. Bureau of Prisons, October, 1972.

Karacki, L., Minor, J. A., Cavior, H. E., and Kennedy, B. Going coed: a case study of the establishment of a coed program at a previously all male institution. Unpublished paper, U.S. Bureau of Prisons, October, 1972.

Lambiotte, J. Sex role differentiation in a co-correctional setting. Unpublished master's thesis, University of California at Santa Barbara, 1977.

Minor, J. A. The coed program at the Kennedy Youth Center. Unpublished paper, April, 1972.

Patrick, J. Doing time: an ethnography of a co-correctional institution. Unpublished report, U. S. Bureau of Prisons, May, 1976.

Prisons: boys and girls together. Newsweek, July 23, 1973, 82 (4), 23-24.

Rans, L. and Gabel-Strickland, K. Evaluation of co-correctional institutions for adults. Unpublished paper, October, 1976.

Ross, J. G., Heffernan, E., Sevick, J. R., and Johnson, F. T. Issues paper: Phase I evaluation of coeducational corrections. Washington, D.C.: Koba Associates, Inc., 1977.

Ross, J. G., Heffernan, E., Sevick, J. R., and Johnson, F. T. Interventions papers: Phase I assessment of coeducational corrections. Washington, D.C.: Koba Associates, Inc., 1977.

Ross, J. G., Heffernan, E., Sevick, J. R., and Johnson, F. T. Frameworks paper: Phase I assessment of coeducational corrections. Washington, D.C.: Koba Associates, Inc., 1977.

Ross, J. G., Heffernan, E., Sevick, J. R., and Johnson, F. T. Knowledge assessment: Phase I assessment of coeducational corrections. Washington, D.C.: Koba Associates, Inc., 1977.

Ross, J. G., Heffernan, E., Sevick, J. R., and Johnson, F. T. Phase II design: Phase I assessment of coeducational corrections. Washington, D.C.: Koba Associates, Inc., 1977.

Ross, J. G., Heffernan, E., Sevick J. R., and Johnson, F. T. Single-site evaluation design: Phase I assessment of coeducational corrections. Washington, D.C.: Koba Associates, Inc., 1977.

Ross, W. F. The women's unit. Federal Correctional Institution, Lexington, Kentucky. Unpublished paper, no date.

Ruback, B. The sexually integrated prison -- a legal and policy evaluation. American Journal of Criminal Law, 1975, 3, 310-330.

Schweber-Koren, C. Integration and education: a study of the education of adult women in the Federal prisons, 1975-1976. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1977.

Smykla, J. O. A phenomenological analysis of the social environment in a coed prison. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1977.

Stowers, C. A coed prison without bars. Parade, February 11, 1973, 8-9.

Vanier Center for Women. An evaluation of co-correctional recreational programs. Unpublished report, December, 1975.

☆U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1978-260-992/2166